PLANS FOR CONDUCTING 1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS IN HAWAII AND PACIFIC REGION

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

DECEMBER, 28, 1988

Serial No. 100-75

Printed for the use of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

96-116 WASHINGTON : 1989

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

H621-17

96-116 O - 89 - 1

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
ROBERT GARCIA, New York
MICKEY LELAND, Texas
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio
GERRY SIKORSKI, Minnesota
FRANK McCLOSKEY, Indiana
GARY L. ACKERMAN, New York
MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
GENE TAYLOR, Missouri
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR., California
FRANK HORTON, New York
JOHN T. MYERS, Indiana
DON YOUNG, Alaska
DAN BURTON, Indiana
CONSTANCE A. MORELLA, Maryland

TOM DEYULIA, *Staff Director*
ROBERT E. LOCKHART, *General Counsel*
PATRICIA F. RISSLER, *Deputy Staff Director and Chief Clerk*
JOSEPH A. FISHER, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION

MERVYN M. DYMALLY, California, *Chairman*

ROBERT GARCIA, New York
GERRY SIKORSKI, Minnesota
CONSTANCE A MORELLA, Maryland
DAN BURTON, Indiana

TERRIANN LOWENTHAL, *Subcommittee Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Statement of: Page

Hon. Daniel K. Akaka, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii 2

Hon. Patricia F. Saiki, a Representative in Congress from the State of Hawaii 4

Patricia Brandt, administrative assistant, Office of the Governor; accompanied by Robert Schmitt, Department of Business and Economic Development 4

Peter R. Barcinas, acting director, Department of Commerce, Government of Guam 10

Faye Untalon Munoz, assistant professor, School of Public Health, University of Hawaii 23

John Faumuina, deputy director, Department of Economic Development, American Samoa 25

Joyce Kahane, planning officer, Office of Hawaiian Affairs; Pat Luce, director, Office of Samoan Affairs; Jerry B. Norris, executive director, Pacific Basin Development Council 28

Joyce Kahane 28

Pat Luce 32

Jerry B. Norris 35

Peter Bounpane, Associate Director for Decennial Census, Bureau of the Census 37

PLANS FOR CONDUCTING 1990 DECENNIAL CENSUS IN HAWAII AND PACIFIC REGION

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1988

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 9:35 a.m., in the Hawaii State Capitol Auditorium, Honolulu, Hawaii, Hon. Mervyn M. Dymally (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Mr. DYMALLY. Shall we get started?

Good morning. I have to assume nobody knows me in Hawaii. My name is Mervyn Dymally. I chair the Subcommittee on Census and Population.

I would like to take this opportunity to express my deep thanks to Congressman Akaka for his assistance in putting this meeting together and his staff for their generosity.

I am so very pleased to see Congresswoman Pat Saiki here today. She gives the necessary bipartisan support to this effort; and the whole question of the census is an issue without any partisan politics.

Were it not for the Congressman, I do not know that we would have been able to hold this meeting. It is not the first time I have told him that I was coming here.

In fact, last year, I was scheduled to come here and we had to cancel.

This morning we will hear testimony on the plans for conducting the 1990 census in Hawaii and the Pacific region.

By Pacific region, I refer to our territories in the Pacific: Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. Unfortunately, the Northern Mariana Islands do not have a representative today. If they have a statement, we will enter it into the record.

Let me also set the record straight on our original plans to hold separate hearings for each territory. I was excited about bringing the subcommittee to the territories. Even my plane reservations were confirmed. Then a couple of things happened: scheduling problems and the budget.

I realize our territories would have preferred separate hearings, and it is still my intention to hold some next year, which is the final year for the preparation before the census is taken in 1990.

The census on population and housing taken every ten years is the most thorough method for gathering information in our country. The information is used to reapportion seats in the House of

Representatives, redraw congressional district boundaries, guide the distribution of Federal dollars, improve government programs, and assist governmental response to public need.

For these reasons, which are among the essential uses for the census, I find it critical to obtain the most accurate counts possible.

Among census activities related to Hawaii and the territories, the subcommittee is particularly interested in the Census Bureau's schedule for printing the questionnaire, promotion and outreach, hiring census enumerators, tabulation and publication of data, timeliness of releasing the information, and data updates.

I am particularly concerned about the delay of census data to the territories. I understand it took five years after the 1980 census to provide our Pacific territories with their census information. I hope we can change that for the next census.

These are the types of issues about which the subcommittee hopes to hear testimony this morning.

Having said that, let me call on my colleagues to make some observations.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Akaka?

STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank you for coming to Hawaii to conduct this hearing for the Pacific area. I want to tell you, too, I am glad everything worked out with the difficulties we have had with the reservations. I am glad to see you here.

I am also glad to see the folks from the Pacific region here who will be witnesses this morning. I want to take the time and welcome the chairman this morning by asking Debra to present him with our lei of welcome here in Hawaii.

Mr. DYMALLY. I feel at home now.

Mr. AKAKA. I should add that whenever we give somebody a lei, that means he belongs. So we want you to feel as though you belong to us in Hawaii.

This field hearing and forum is essential as our country prepares for the 1990 census. The national census is one of the key methods of gathering basic statistical information on the state of our country and its people.

Come 1990, our Government's census takers or enumerators will go from place to place throughout our country, gathering information on our population, creating a current profile on the people of these United States. Indeed, this will be a monumental task.

In ancient Rome, census takers gathered information chiefly for tax purposes. In fact, the word census comes from the Latin word meaning to tax.

As my colleague has noted, the national census has a broader purpose. Among the many uses for this data, information collected is used to reapportion seats in the U.S. House of Representatives, redraw congressional district boundaries, and aid in the determination of funding allocations.

But we understate the importance of the census taking in the Pacific if we ignore the changes that have come about within the last

ten years. Shifts in our world economy, the progress made by the Pacific Rim Nations and the strategic defense needs of our country have attracted much attention to the Pacific region.

I, for one, am excited over the potential opportunities for our country and for the people of my state as the Pacific comes of age . . . a Pacific era.

Data collection on our Pacific communities through the census will have innumerable benefits for both the public and private sectors in helping business and government prepare for entry into the next decade.

Noting the concerns expressed by my chairman with regard to plans for conducting the census, I am also interested in hearing the special problems of Hawaii and other jurisdictions in the Pacific.

I am looking for the local perspective, problems experienced in the last census and problems we can foreseeably expect in this census. Because of geography and various other differences, it is not difficult to recognize the unique concerns inherent in island-based communities such as Hawaii and other areas in the Pacific.

I am also interested in the Census Bureau's efforts to collect race-related data in their population counts. As some here are aware, I co-sponsored a bill in this Congress to modify the collection of information on Asian American and Pacific Islander groups in the coming census.

This legislation was adopted by both bodies of Congress, but failed to receive the President's approval.

H.R. 4432 would have required the Bureau to use a check-off system listing Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders by various ethnic subgroups as a means of ensuring an accurate count of our country's Asian American and Pacific Islander populations.

I cosponsored this bill, noting the concerns expressed by Asian and Pacific Islanders throughout this country who fear that the Bureau's current survey method will result in a population undercount that will substantially affect the delivery of government services and political representation to those groups.

During consideration of this bill, my colleagues and I who supported this legislation faced opposition from forces unwilling to recognize the serious and legitimate claim of our Asian and Pacific Islander populations.

While we failed to see this legislation become public law in the 100th Congress, plans are being made to reintroduce this bill when the new Congress convenes in January. But these concerns, I expect, will be addressed in this morning's hearing.

Finally, I want to acknowledge our representative from the Census Bureau. Our first official census was the U.S. census of 1790. Our Constitution provided that a count of the people had to be made within three years of the first meeting of Congress and every ten years thereafter.

Now, 200 years later, we arrive at the 1990 census. My congratulations and hats off to the Bureau in helping to carry out our Constitution's mandates. To my knowledge, the Bureau is the greatest fact-finding and figure-counting body in the word.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for holding this hearing for our Pacific jurisdictions and my appreciation for the invitation to join you to hear the testimony this morning.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you, Congressman.

STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICIA F. SAIKI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

Mrs. SAIKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to echo the thoughts expressed by my colleague.

As one who was stuck in Chicago for six hours in the middle of the snow storm, I know what you went through.

The good news is everybody is headed for Hawaii. We may provide a little bit of a shuffling at the airports, but it is money in the bank to us.

The work that is being done by your subcommittee is to be hailed, Mr. Chairman, because we are talking here about an area that affects the future and that impacts, of course, the funding, the sorting out of ethnic relationships as well as the uniqueness of Hawaii and the Pacific region.

We deal with industries that may be a little bit different—I would say quite a bit different—from what you find in Ohio or Indiana. I think the way we take our count is going to be critical to the planning for the state, city, and county for the entire Pacific region.

I hail your recognition that this kind of hearing is so critical here in Hawaii and certainly I look forward to continuing to work with you as we make definitive plans for the census of 1990.

Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much.

To both of you, you have no idea how much I regret the President did not see fit to sign the bill, because it creates a very serious problem in California, my home state, not to mention, of course, the rest of the region here.

I am hopeful we can impress upon the Bureau, if not the President, the need to have either this method instituted by administrative fiat or to sign the bill again on an emergency nature.

I trust the Bureau will respond to rumors I keep hearing that they don't have time, that they are at the printer right now. That troubles me. If they are, then we have serious problems.

Our first witness today is Mr. Towill, Deputy Director of the Hawaii State Office of State Planning.

STATEMENT OF PATRICIA BRANDT, ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT, OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR, ACCOMPANIED BY ROBERT SCHMITT, DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Ms. BRANDT. Good morning.

I am obviously not Mr. Towill. I am Pat Brandt, an Administrative Assistant to the Governor dealing with Hawaiian affairs and education here today to represent Murray Towill from the Office of State Planning.

As an aside before I begin this testimony, I would like to add that I sit on the working committee for the census on the Asian and Pacific Advisory Group. I would like to say that we have been testifying in the seventies, in the eighties, and it looks like now in the nineties.

The information that we need on population growth, geographic shifts and other data essential to servicing our people still eludes us. We are here again to ask for your help.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. There is little we can add regarding the Census Bureau's outreach programs and follow-up procedures or the role of local governments and community organizations in the decennial census.

We suspect, moreover, that it is now too late to urge changes be made in census content, definitions, or the wording of questions.

Over the past five years, we have made a number of such recommendations, none of which, unfortunately, was accepted.

Our primary criticism is that the U.S. Census, as presently conducted, continues to misrepresent the numbers of Asian and Pacific Island peoples and fails to recognize the vast differences and needs among the groups that make up that category.

The undercount particularly hampers the State of Hawaii with our need for statistics on native Hawaiians and our large population of people of mixed breeds.

We can, however, point out some of the problems inherent in the final census questionnaire, which can still be minimized by improved instructions or modified tabulation procedures.

One such problem area is the question on race, which makes no allowance for the high proportion of Hawaii residents of mixed ethnic background.

More than 30 percent of our population and over 60 percent of the babies born to civilian couples have interracial antecedents. Most of these persons consider themselves mixed, and do not identify with a single part of their ancestry.

Past censuses have unfortunately failed either to provide a category for such persons or, in the absence of such a classification, have omitted any instructions as to how they should answer the racial question.

Hawaiians, for instance, have traditionally called themselves Chinese-Hawaiian or Japanese-Hawaiian; and in a mixed counting, the first box checked or first item listed is generally picked up rather than the second.

That is one of the reasons for the significant undercounting of native Hawaiians.

To avoid any confusion, and to make the racial tabulations more meaningful than in the past, the 1990 questionnaire should prominently include instructions on how persons of mixed race, not identifying themselves with any one specific race, should respond.

Another set of problems results from our high proportions of housing units on leased land and condominium units intended for transient use. Almost one-fourth of all owner-occupied units in Hawaii are on leased land.

Questions on the value of such units have always intended that the respondents include the estimated value of the land in their answers, but this was apparently not always understood; consequently, past censuses have tended to underreport housing values for the state.

Here again, clear instructions would result in more relevant responses.

A more intractable problem is posed by the great number of condominium units intended for transient occupancy. Such units, numbering 21,000 or more, greatly distort statistics on housing stock and vacancy rates. Efforts should be made to identify such units and treat them as a special category, perhaps by modifying tabulation programs.

Finally, we should like to urge the Bureau of the Census to take special care in enumerating Hawaii's resort areas, such as Waikiki, West Maui, the Kihei and Wailea areas, or West Hawaii.

Both in 1970 and 1980, there was indirect evidence that the census count was especially inaccurate in such areas.

In part, this resulted from difficulties in classifying long-term visitors, whose usual place of residence may have been misreported. More significantly, however, the census appears to have missed residents living in areas dominated by transient accommodations.

The State of Hawaii is fully aware of the importance of conducting a complete, accurate, and meaningful enumeration, and pledges its wholehearted cooperation with the Bureau in this important work.

I also would like to say with me today is Mr. Robert Schmitt from the Department of Business and Economic Development, our resident expert on statistics; and he will be most happy to be available to you if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Would you tell us what plans, if any, are being instituted by your office and the Census Bureau for outreach purposes?

Ms. BRANDT. The Census Bureau is responsible for outreach efforts. The state has not been asked to take any specific role as of yet, although we are cooperating in distributing information and such. I have not heard of any specific initiatives yet that we have been asked to participate in.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman Akaka?

Mr. AKAKA. Yes.

Pat, can you tell me what OSP's ten-year projection on the state population is?

Ms. BRANDT. I am afraid I can't.

Bob, can you answer that?

Mr. SCHMITT. The Department of Business and Economic Development has just completed some projections to the year 2020 which pretty much track the Bureau of the Census statewide projections that have just been released.

As you may know, the Bureau of the Census has projected, for example, that Hawaii will be one of the most rapidly growing states in the nineties and will be the most rapidly growing state between 2000 and 2010.

This is pretty much confirmed by our own projections which are made by a totally different method.

Mr. AKAKA. Would you please provide that for the committee by county also?

Mr. SCHMITT. We will be happy to do so.

[The information follows:]

Table 17.-- POPULATION PROJECTIONS, RESIDENT AND DE FACTO, BY COUNTIES: 1985 TO 2010

[Thousands. As of July 1. Series M-K projections, developed by DBED]

Type of population and year	State total	City and County of Honolulu	Other counties			
			Total	Hawaii	Kauai	Maui 1/
Resident population: 2/						
1985	1,051.5	811.1	240.4	109.5	45.4	85.5
1990	1,137.2	861.6	275.6	124.6	54.1	96.8
1995	1,225.2	910.4	314.9	142.5	61.1	111.2
2000	1,285.1	932.8	352.4	160.4	68.2	123.9
2005	1,350.8	961.1	389.7	180.8	75.5	133.4
2010	1,435.5	999.5	435.9	206.1	84.6	145.2
De facto population: 3/						
1985	1,149.6	861.6	288.1	116.1	56.2	115.7
1990	1,269.1	928.0	341.2	134.4	70.1	136.7
1995	1,382.3	983.1	399.2	158.6	81.7	159.0
2000	1,468.6	1,012.5	456.1	183.0	94.0	179.1
2005	1,560.3	1,048.5	511.9	211.0	104.8	196.0
2010	1,674.2	1,094.7	579.5	243.0	120.3	216.2

1/ Includes Kalawao.

2/ The resident population is defined as the number of persons whose usual place of residence is in an area, regardless of physical location on the estimate or census date. It includes military personnel stationed or homeported in the area but excludes persons of local origin attending school or in military service outside the area.

3/ The de facto population is defined as the number of persons physically present in an area, regardless of military status or usual place of residence; it includes visitors present but excludes residents temporarily absent.

Source: Hawaii State Department of Business and Economic Development, Series M-K, forthcoming report.

!No letter
October!

Mr. DYMALLY. What do you anticipate will be your population in the year 2000?

Mr. SCHMITT. By the year 2000, we are now something like 1.1 million; and we expect—roughly one and a quarter million by 1997. It would be about 1.3 million in the year 2000. That is resident population.

It does not include visitors present who add 150,000 right now and will be adding 250,000 to the number of persons physically present in the state by the year 2000.

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Schmitt, from the data that you gathered, can you give us an idea of the services that will be most impacted in your projections?

Mr. SCHMITT. The types of services that would be impacted?

Mr. AKAKA. Yes.

Mr. SCHMITT. I would say it would be quite general, be hard to pinpoint any. The growth that we anticipate will be both from the Mainland and from abroad, for example.

We expect to continue receiving large numbers of immigrants.

As a state, we rank very close to the top in the number of immigrant arrivals per thousand population.

For example, the Filipinos have been our largest migrant group. They tend to have very special needs in public welfare, educational needs, language problems, and so on. Also, they tend to be fairly low in income.

Former President Marcos is not really typical of the ordinary Filipino migrant.

So that you could say there will be a continuing increase in the welfare needs and educational needs in the state.

Mr. AKAKA. So from what you have said, Mr. Schmitt, in answer to my question, the welfare services or social services will be heavily impacted at that time?

Mr. SCHMITT. I would say so, yes.

Mr. DYMALLY. What about housing? Do you have a homeless problem here?

Mr. SCHMITT. We not only have a homeless problem, you may have noticed in the daily newspaper a story on that, a continuing story this week. The estimates of the homeless population, for example, are very rough indeed, but Hawaii has one of the lowest vacancy rates in the country based on limited but obviously significant information.

Although housing construction has kept pace with population, the problem is that many of these housing units are in condominiums intended for transient occupancy.

So if you exclude those units, our growth in the housing stock has not been proportionate to the growth in population or the growth in households.

Of course, households being equivalent to occupied housing units, as they increase quite rapidly in the total housing inventory, and the total stock increases quite slowly, it means the vacancy rate diminishes very rapidly.

Ms. BRANDT. In meeting with our colleagues from across the different states, we also find a significant problem in the growth or the geographic changes among immigrant groups and small pockets of Asian and Pacific Islander groups; so their needs and charac-

teristics are changing as the years go by; in terms of one specific example, the aging of our population and different needs in terms of education and housing and social services and medical care.

By excluding them from the census or by lumping them into a larger category, we miss the signals that we could be getting from where those groups are heading for and what their needs are.

Mr. DYMALLY. Ms. Saiki?

Mrs. SAIKI. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Schmitt, you mentioned there is approximately 150,000 transients, is that correct?

Mr. SCHMITT. That is right, on an annual average basis.

Mr. DYMALLY. Would you consider them residents long enough in Hawaii to be counted in the census?

Mr. SCHMITT. No. The average length of stay for the visitors from the Mainland is 10.3 days. The average length of stay for visitors from Japan, who now make up a fifth of all visitors, is only five days. As a result, they are obviously in a very transient status.

However, when you have something like six million visitor arrivals a year, there are enough of them staying for periods from three weeks to maybe three months that there is a problem in deciding whether some of these are indeed transient or part-time residents.

On the Island of Maui, for example, we have had historically for more than a decade now large numbers of Canadians who spend the whole winter here. These may pose a problem in classification, where Census enumerators or they themselves in responding to the census questionnaires may not be able to make the distinctions between resident and non-resident.

Mr. DYMALLY. Well, perhaps we could arrange for the visitors to come April 1, 1990, and you would end up with 12 Congressmen.

Mrs. SAIKI. One short question, Mr. Chairman.

Can you expand a little bit on the military and how you count them?

Mr. DYMALLY. Do you count the military?

Mr. SCHMITT. In our estimates—by the way, the State of Hawaii is part of the Federal-State Cooperative Program for local population estimates. We—the Health Department, the Department of Business and Economic Development, and the Census Bureau—jointly produce estimates of state population.

These are also included in our projections and in 1988, for example, we had 134,000 members of the armed forces or military dependents stationed in or homeported in Hawaii.

Now these people are treated as resident population for census purposes.

In the case of redistricting, however, the Federal courts did approve redistricting based on what they call resident population, which was not resident in the census sense.

It excluded military and dependents who were registered in other states, which turned out to be something like 98 percent or 97 percent of the total number of adult military and dependents.

Mr. DYMALLY. You have given us very valuable information.

Pat, will you continue?

Ms. BRANDT. That is it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much, indeed.

Very good.

Now we will hear from—is anyone from Guam here or American Samoa?

STATEMENT OF PETER R. BARCINAS, ACTING DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, GOVERNMENT OF GUAM

Mr. BARCINAS. Mr. Chairman, members of the subcommittee, I am Peter Barcinas, Acting Director for the Guam Department of Commerce.

The Governor is unable to personally provide testimony at this hearing, but has asked I extend a warm hafa adai and sincere si yu'os ma'ase for allowing us to present written and oral testimony at this time.

On behalf of the people of Guam, I am pleased to accept your invitation to submit testimony on Guam's census. There are four topics I would like to discuss: census procedures, Guam's census data needs, Census Bureau policy objectives for Guam, and some suggestions for improved communications.

Guam has different census concepts and definitions from those of the U.S. Mainland because of local conditions and our small population.

Decennial censuses are conducted door to door because we do not have home mail delivery.

Also, there is no sample; instead, all of the questions are asked of every household and person.

Guam has become even more multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, and multi-lingual now than it was in 1980 because of increased immigration.

The outreach program will help ensure that all persons are counted, and therefore, minimize the undercount. Special attention is needed here.

Also, field selection materials and enumerator training materials must have local input to be effective and must be received early.

In 1970, Guam received its materials 24 days after the census began, and in 1980, the materials were delayed in Hawaii.

Third, the matter of local participation. In previous censuses, once the completed questionnaire left the island, Guam's involvement with the census ended. Only persons unfamiliar with the island's local geography and ethnic groups were involved in coding, editing, and tabulating the data.

We have asked before, and we would like to request here again, that the census processing be done in Guam. We have the best expertise available and we would like to use it.

Also, this exercise can be very useful for training people to be knowledgeable census users.

Local and planning goals require census data. Unfortunately, 1970 census results were largely unusable because race and military/civilian data were not tabulated.

A better tabulation plan was developed by the Bureau and the Government of Guam for 1980.

Unfortunately, most of the 1980 data were not released until in 1985, nor were the problems we have raised with race and military resolved.

Again, we were unable to get full use of our data.

A single questionnaire will be used in all areas to maintain basic consistency and to facilitate processing.

The question is would the use of a single questionnaire in the three areas meet the needs of any one of them? After all, these are diverse areas with different histories and cultures.

Also, can we be assured that comparability can be met without sacrificing our unique data needs?

This is a concern that must still be resolved.

Also, will a single questionnaire really facilitate data processing?

The Bureau expects to use microcomputers to process our data and we have agreed to the concept.

However, we have not officially adopted this plan because we have not seen it in operation, and continue to have reservations.

Some concerns are: Who will be responsible for coding, editing, and tabulating our data? Where and when would these operations take place? When will we receive a schedule of data products to be produced and a timetable for their release?

I truly hope Guam's 1990 information will be available sooner than it was after 1980, and in a format that will facilitate use.

Let me summarize with some suggestions: First, I suggest that the Bureau assist with the early development of locally relevant outreach to ensure the complete count of Guam's multi-cultural population. This activity should be fully integrated with ongoing ICP activities. The Bureau should budget to develop much of the material locally.

Second, in addressing the territory's data needs and how they are to be met, I would like to see a questionnaire which appropriately reflects the population composition and dynamics of Guam.

Third, I would like to suggest that the Bureau work directly with the Interagency Committee on Population to develop a plan for tabulations and data products.

As soon as the questionnaire has been approved, we should start on this plan, and we should be consulted at every step along the way as changes occur for one reason or another.

Not all data needs can be anticipated in advance, so I would suggest that some type of arrangement be made between the Bureau and Guam for greater access to our census data.

To end on a positive note, in many ways the Census Bureau has been very generous in recent years, helping to train our people to produce Guam's first population monograph. What was asked earlier in the exchange of questions is basically contained in a 1980 summary of all census data concerns and issues regarding military, housing, some of the economic characteristics.

All of that in one form or another is looked at in greater detail using the census data.

Lastly is the inception of the Territorial State Data Center. That was something in 1987 which we adopted as a plan to use the State Data Center Program in Guam as part of being more aware of Census Bureau activities.

To date, we have been receiving a lot of the materials and that is very positive. We hope to ask for more training to come with that.

These small steps have been appreciated particularly after the many problems we seem to have after every census to get data.

Still, the Census Bureau needs to remember that although we are small, in many ways our needs are as important as those of any state and many times cannot be met with the same data as for a state.

Finally, I look forward to continuing and strengthening the working relationship with the Census Bureau that has now been established.

[The statement of Governor Ada follows:]

STATEMENT
OF THE
HONORABLE JOSEPH F. ADA
GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

On behalf of the people of Guam, I am pleased to accept your invitation to submit testimony on Guam's censuses. There are five topics I would like to discuss: first, Census Bureau policy obectives in regard to Guam and the other Pacific Outlying Areas; second, the Paperwork Reduction Act; third, Guam's census data needs; fourth, census procedures; and fifth, suggestions on ways the 1990 census could be improved.

Guam has been priviledged to participate in federal population and agriculture censuses beginning in 1920, the decennial housing census beginning in 1950, and the quinquennial economic census since 1958. The Government of Guam became involved with the actual conduct of the censuses through special agreement with the Census Bureau in 1973. A special agreement will be negotiated before the 1990 census as well.

Census data represents Guam's primary source of data for applications for federal aid. The island does not currently use census data for Congressional redistricting or reapportionment, as it is used in the States, because local elections for our unicameral legislature and our Congressional delegate are held at-large, and because we have at presentjust one delegate to the U.S. Congress.

CENSUS BUREAU POLICY OBJECTIVES

I would like to begin my remarks by addressing the special policy objective developed by the Census Bureau for the Pacific Outlying Areas. Census Bureau policy is central to the success of both the conduct of Guam's 1990 census and the data released. The Census Bureau has determined that American Samoa, the Northern Mariana Islands,and Guam will be treated identically with the use of a single questionnaire that will be tailored to meet the specific needs of each area, while at the same time maintaining some basic consistency to provide comparable data for each area and to facilitate processing.

I personally feel the Pacific Areas concerned are politically, culturally, and economically so diverse that this may be inappropriate. The policy directs that a single questionnaire will serve the "specific data needs" of each area. The questionnaire has not yet been finalized, so I am not in the position to make definite statements about specific questionnaire content. I will say, however, that I am concerned that the use of a single questionnaire in three such different areas will not totally meet the needs of anyone. The problem of a single questionnaire for the three areas is compounded by compliance to the Paperwork Reduction Act, which limits the number of questions that will be asked, thus forcing a compromise between the data needs of the three areas.

For instance, on the population questionnaire, the characteristics of our military and civilian residents is critically important to the utility of Guam's data. Nearly 20 percent of the total population consists of active duty military personnel and their dependents. This is not the case in either the Northern Mariana Islands or American Samoa, and is therefore not an issue in any of the three areas except Guam.

96-116 0 - 89 - 2

Demographic analysis of immigrants is specifically mandated by P.L.99-239, the Compact of Free Association, which requires the Department of the Interior to monitor the impact of immigration to the Territories by citizens from the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands. However, because all three Outlying Areas have different immigration rules and regulations, and different terminology to define its immigrants, a homogenized question on immigration status could prove useless for the purpose of analysis.

There are additional questions on the population questionnaire concerning vocational education and literacy that Guam's Interagency Committee on Population (ICP) feels are unnecessary census questions. These should be discarded in favor of questions of greater relevance. Guam's Interagency Committee was, by the way, formed by the Governor at the request of the Census Bureau to submit proposals for the draft 1990 population and housing questionnaires. The ICP represents Guam's experts on census data needs, and provides my office with recommendations on questionnaire content and other matters pertaining to the census.

On the housing questionnaire, it is important for Guam's content to be as comparable to U.S. content as possible. Unfortunately, the proposed draft housing questionnaire is a major departure from the U.S. questionnaire. We are recommending the use of a questionnaire similar to the U.S. questionnaire, with the addition of two questions on material of construction and on the availability of a radio.

Specific objections we have to the draft proposal include 1) the order in which the questions are asked barely approximates the order of questions on the Stateside questionnaire; 2) the use of the phrase "living quarters" as opposed to "house or apartment," as is asked on the U.S. questionnaire; 3) plumbing information asked for inside the building, rather than within the individual housing unit; and 4) separate components of kitchen facilities using four different questions, rather than one complete kitchen question. There are also differences in the wording of many questions that I am concerned could impact on comparability with the U.S. data, such as asking the respondent "Do you have a mortgage on this property?" rather than "Is there a mortgage on this property?"

The Census Bureau policy directs that a single questionnaire will provide comparable data for each area. I believe there could be some debate on just what Guam's data should be comparable to. There are serveral options. First, there is comparability to our own 1980 data for the purpose of analyzing trends; second, there is comparability to the 1990 U.S. data for the purpose of federal reporting; and third, there is comparability to the other two Pacific outlying areas' 1990 data. There are benefits to each option, depending on the exact data under consideration.

The policy of the Census Bureau indicates that a single questionnaire will facilitate data processing. This will apparently be accomplished through use of microcomputers to process Guam's data. We waited five years for the release of our complement of data after the 1980 census, far too long to have the data of use for other than an historic record. I believe the Census Bureau is well aware of this problem, and I truly hope Guam's 1990 data will be available sooner.

Census Bureau staff, Mr. Bounpane, in fact, who has also been invited to testify before this Subcommittee, did discuss with myself and with the Interagency Committee on Population in early 1987, the possibility of using microcomputers to process our data. However, I have never endorsed a plan for the use of the system because no plan has been presented to myself or the ICP. I, therefore, have no way of knowing if and how the use of microcomputers will facilitate data

processing, or why the microcomputer system could not facilitate the processing of more than one questionnaire.

THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT

I would like to address the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 next because it represents federal policy that also directly influences the types and number of questions that can appear on the 1990 census of population and housing questionnaire. The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 authorizes the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to review and act on Federal agency requests for approval of individual information collections. In this case, the U.S. Department of Commerce will submit Guam's questionnaire in the form of a clearance package to OMB. OMB will ascertain the practical utility of the questionnaire with the goal of reducing the paperwork burden on the public to the minimum necessary for the Federal government to carry out its functions.

The Director of OMB, Mr. James C. Miller III, has informed me that he will welcome my comments on the clearance submission of the questionnaire to be used to collect the 1990 census information in Guam when the Department of Commerce submits these forms for OMB review. I intend to do so. However, the Census Bureau is hesitant to place certain questions on the questionnaire in the first place because the Census Bureau assumes that these questions may not be acceptable to OMB.

I would like to stress to this Subcommittee that, while Guam's data needs are important for federal program purposes, they are vital for local use. Our need to be able to separate the active-duty military and dependent population from the civilian population is particularly acute, and has not been met with past census data.

CENSUS DATA NEEDS

I would like to address my next remarks to some of the problems with Guam's past decennial census data and my concerns for the 1990 census. The potential of census data for local planning and research is unequalled. Unfortunately, however, 1970 census results were largely unusable because critical data elements needed for analysis were lacking. There were no data on the race of the population, and no separation of data for the military and civilian populations in either the population or housing reports in 1970. We were unable to use census data to determine the percent of minority population on the island or to discern differences in demographic characteristics of the different segments of the population. We were unable to chart true population growth or to do accurate population projections because of the presence of transient active-duty military personnel and their dependents in every single table. Additionally, in most instances, data were available only as frequency counts in the single 60 page report released on Guam's population characteristics. No special studies were conducted.

Because of what were considered by local users of the data to be serious flaws in 1970 census data, local planners worked with Census Bureau planners to ensure that additional information would be available for the 1980 census. They were assured that there would be no problem in obtaining the data requested. A tabulation plan was requested by the Census Burea and prepared by the Government of Guam to ensure our needs would be met.

And yet, when the final 1980 data were released in 1985, neither the race nor military/civilian data problems were resolved. Additionally, not only did the amount of published data on Guam's population characteristics remain at 60 pages, the tabulation plan prepared by the Government of Guam was ignored. I have been told that had it not been for the personal efforts of one lone staff-level person within the Census Bureau, our published data on Guam's population characteristics would have been a scant 20 pages. Again, no special studies were conducted, although the Government of Guam requested, and received, a retabulation of our data to try to separate the transient military from the tables. This was for a fee, by the way.

There was a nearly infinite amount of census information potentially at our disposal after 1980. Being selective with the release of information is, obviously, necessary to avoid being overwhelmed by a mass of detail. However, having useful and appropriate information beyond our reach is frustrating, and in my opinion, wasteful.

The following question is posed to this Subcommittee, "Why go to the considerable time and expense of collecting a great wealth of information if it is inappropriate or is destined to only be 'lost'?", to borrow an expression heard often from the Census Bureau. The term "lost" appears to mean that although the data are there, on computer tape file, the Census Bureau has no intention of ever retrieving, tabulating or publishing the information for the Government of Guam.

To illustrate, the 1980 census questionnaire contained a series of questions concerning whether a person had lived in the U.S. for at least 6 months during the previous 10 years, and, if so, their activity in the U.S. The questions were asked in order to analyze the movement of locally born persons to and from the U.S. As it turned out, no data were published from these four questions. Limited data were available in Summary Tape File 3A as two tables classified by sex, and one table classified by age group and sex. Those three tables contained the total population and proved completely useless for the analysis intended. When I consider the wealth of other information that might have been made use of as well, I feel that a great potential has been left unrealized.

CENSUS PROCEDURES

Census methods for Guam have been altered to accomodate local conditions and our small population size. The lack of islandwide home delivery of mail has led to past decennial censuses being conducted by the list/enumerate or door-to-door method, rather than through the mail, which I understand is also being planned for 1990. Another change from stateside procedures is that no sample data will be collected. Instead 100% of the questions will be asked of every household.

There are other local conditions which warrant changes to standard stateside procedures. They are in the areas of Guam's outreach program, enumerator training materials, and local participation.

The Outreach Program is basic to ensuring that an undercount will be minimized. Guam has become even more multi-cultural, multi-ethnic, and multi-lingual now than it was in 1980. This has been caused by increasing immigration. Certain ethnic groups, such as the Micronesian population, will have grown substantially by 1990. The English language ability of some of these immigrant groups is not as high as it is among our indigenous peoples. We therefore have a special concern with ensuring the understanding and cooperation of the entire population in responding to census questions.

The second topic of concern is the effectiveness of field selection materials and enumerator training materials. The use of visual aids such as videotapes would be very helpful. However, no matter how effective the materials may be, it is essential that they be received early. In 1970, Guam received these materials only after the census had begun. In 1980, the materials were delayed at the Honolulu International Airport. I am hopeful this will not happen again.

Third, the matter of local participation. In previous censuses, once the completed questionnaires left the island, Guam's involvement with the census came to an end. Persons unfamiliar with the island's local geographic place names and ethnic groups have had complete responsibility for coding, editing and tabulating the data. I feel the accuracy of the results of the data would be enhanced by the presence of persons at the Census Bureau who are familiar with local conditions.

SUGGESTIONS

In closing, I would like to offer several suggestions that I hope the Census Bureau will consider implementing. These suggestions are being proposed because of the special responsibility I have in the conduct of our censuses. In the states, the Census Bureau has full responsibility for all aspects of census planning and conduct; however, in Guam the census is actually conducted by the Governor through special agreement. I therefore feel a personal responsibility in attempting to secure a thorough and complete census that will yield accurate and relevant results.

First, I suggest that Guam's census questionnaire reflect our need for appropriate data, data that may not be required by federal programs in every instance. The island, being a small, cosmopolitan area, does not fit the mainland demographic "norms." I suspect that some of the other areas represented at this hearing are in the same position. We do not have a "closed" population. Therefore, migration is a major factor in our population growth and change; immigration from foreign countries is large compared to the total size of our population; no one ethnic group makes up a majority of the population; birth rates are higher; death rates are lower because critically ill persons seek health care off-island in many instances; and the transient active-duty military and their dependents are an integral and substantial part of our community. When looking at the United States as a whole, none of these factors affect the "norms" and are therefore not of concern. For Guam, however, these factors must be recognized for census data to be usable. Based on previous decennial census questionnaires, I have grave concerns about how well our needs will be met in 1990 if Guam must fully comply with the intent of the Paperwork Reduction Act. If the three American flag Pacific islands must share a questionnaire, the problem of relevant questionnaire content is even greater.

Second, I would like to suggest that Guam's Interagency Committee on Population work directly with the Census Bureau to develop a tabulation plan and data products. This will permit the Census Bureau to be aware in advance of our specific data needs. As soon as the questionnaire has been approved, I think it would be beneficial for work on a tabulation plan to begin.

Third, because not all data needs or research topics can be anticipated in advance, I would like to suggest that some type of arrangement be made between the Government of Guam and the Census Bureau for greater access to our census data. I feel that a very large sample of the data set for use on-island would be apropo. It should be much larger than the 5 percent microdata sample that has been suggested by the Census Bureau.

Fourth, I respectfully suggest that the Census Bureau provide the full details of the proposed microcomputer processing system, including the procedures for coding, keying, editing, and tabulating the data, who will do these things, where, and when. A schedule of data products and a time-table for their release would also be appreciated.

Fifth, I suggest that the Census Bureau assist with the early development of locally relevant outreach materials to assure the complete enumeration of Guam's multi-cultural population. I will need to know the extent of the Government of Guam's involvement; whether the Census Bureau will develop the materials themselves, contract directly with an advertising firm to develop materials, or give the Government of Guam the funds to develop the materials itself. With the census only a little over one year away, the development of publicity materials for the Outreach Program should be started soon.

Sixth, I suggest that field selection aids and training materials be sent to Guam by air express to avoid being delayed in transit, as has been the case in the past two decennial censuses. Additionally, I suggest that materials in addition to workbook type manuals be developed for training, especially visual aids, such as video tapes. Again, I will need to know whether the Government of Guam will be involved with developing the training materials, and the schedule for their development.

In summary, I feel that the potential of the U.S. census to provide useful and relevant data has yet to be fully met. I am hopeful that the federal government will reevaluate its policy toward the Outlying Areas and ensure the maximum benefit be produced from the costly process of Guam's census enumeration and data processing. I look forward to continuing and strenthening the working relationship with the Census Bureau that has already been established.

Si Yu'os Ma'ase', Thank you very much.

JOSEPH F. ADA
Governor of Guam

December 28, 1988

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Barcinas, do you have a census office or Federal census office or representative in Guam?

Mr. BARCINAS. No, sir.

Mr. DYMALLY. Who do you communicate with?

Mr. BARCINAS. We communicate directly to the Census Bureau.

Mr. DYMALLY. This meeting should end by noon. Would it be possible to meet with Guam and Samoa, to hold a little session about what their needs are and how we could best respond to some of their questions?

Mr. BOUNPANE. Yes, of course.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman Akaka?

Mr. AKAKA. A question that is of interest is your growth and population.

What do you anticipate to be your projection for the next ten years in population in Guam?

Mr. BARCINAS. Because of some of the methodologies being used at this point in time, for 1987, the Census Bureau estimates we will have about 130,000 to 140,000 people on Guam.

In 1988, our projections, it is around 126,000. Because of the point about military population there—23,000, 24,000 at a given time—it is very transient. It is a factor that measures up any projections if we were to adopt a procedure. That is something that we can discuss with the Bureau as to how you count for this particular barrier.

There are so many differing considerations that have to be taken in order to develop an appropriate model for forecasting or projection approaches.

So I don't have that.

In terms of a ten-year projection of what we can anticipate, people, population composition, what it would be like.

These are concerns that have been raised in the Guam monograph, and we hope by the 1990 census, these things are ironed out to some degree.

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYMALLY. Do you have a bilingual problem with the census questionnaire in Guam?

Mr. BARCINAS. Congressman, I am not qualified to make any statement on that.

Mr. DYMALLY. I know in Puerto Rico, they have a bilingual questionnaire. Is the entire population English speaking?

Mr. BARCINAS. Yes.

The large degree speaks English. In that sense, there is no problem there.

Mr. DYMALLY. What accounted for the late delivery of the questionnaire in 1980?

Mr. BARCINAS. The explanation over the years has been the method of delivery and the preparation of the data. I think nowadays it would be frequent modes of transportation to the islands.

I think it is just a matter of lack of coordination in planning and I think that is perhaps an oversight on both parts.

One specific island is always expecting things to come in package form. Only recently when we decided if you want things to come your way, you have to do your own planning schedules and agenda and let the other half know what is expected.

Mr. DYMALLY. Considering the fact you don't have a Federal office in Guam, is the local government doing anything for outreach?

Mr. BARCINAS. As far as an outreach program is concerned, that is at this point what Guam—the Government of Guam, via the Department of Commerce, is doing, is looking at things that would try to take care of the interior matters at hand.

What we have been discussing with the Bureau, with some of their representatives, is looking at an interpersonnel agency agreement where we send somebody on government staff to the Bureau for some type of training and to be there as a subject matter person to handle and address issues and concerns that affect the territory.

In a recent visit to the Bureau, in 1987, I was surprised there was a lot of surprise at the fact I was from Guam. The people handling outlying data were amazing. There are a lot of area references made where the person is making technical decisions as to how procedurally it would fit in.

Just having those little tidbits of information would be helpful.

Having it set up in the appropriate frame of reference is critical. Those little things add up. That is one case where I think a rep in an IPA format would be helpful in setting up a longer-term arrangement. I think that is one area that local involvement should be done where somebody from the territories at least is knowledgeable from an area frame of reference.

Mr. DYMALLY. Did the Census Bureau develop a very good reputation on the state side of tracking all of these groups? The Census Bureau, often the director himself, attends these meetings. He probably would have to teach them to fly to Guam to spend time with you.

Congressman?

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mrs. Saiki?

Mrs. SAIKI. No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much, indeed.

Mr. BARCINAS. Thank you.

[The following additional information was received for the record, as submitted by Mr. Barcinas.]

BRIEFING SERIES ON GUAM'S POPULATION COMPOSITION, PROJECTIONS, AND ESTIMATES
GUAM DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
FEBRUARY 10, 1989

TOPIC: Guam's population composition and population projections and estimates.

BACKGROUND SUMMARY:

The population of Guam is composed of several major ethnic groups: Chamorros (47845, or 45.1%), Whites (26,901, or 25.4%), Filipinos (22,447, or 21.2%), Asians (6,200, or 5.8%), Other Pacific Islanders (2,029, or 1.9%), and Other Ethnicities (557, or 0.5%). It can divided again by the active-duty military and their dependents (27,753, or 21.5%), and the civilian, non-transient population (83,226, or 78.5%). The population is also composed of citizens by birth (78,244, or 73.8%), naturalized citizens (10,201, or 9.6%), permanent resident aliens (14,238, or 13.4%), temporary aliens (2,445, or 2.3%), and other citizenship status (761, or 0.7%).

When computing the estimates of Guam's population, the U.S. Bureau of the Census uses a detailed component method that uses a base population from the 1980 Census, adds natural increase (the excess of births over deaths) for the civilian population, adds the net military increase (or decrease, including natural increase), adds in the net migration increase (or decrease) for the alien population, and a net migration figure for the civilian population from Guam who were inducted into the military (copy of report enclosed). Guam has encountered several problems with the methodology and the underlying assumptions used by the Bureau. In detail, they are:

1). The base population used by the Bureau for the Federally-affiliated population (active-duty military, their dependents, and stateside hire workers under contract with the military, and their dependents) on Guam on April 1, 1980 is assumed to be all those who reported that they were born in the United States. While many of the Federally-affiliated population may have been born in the U.S., not all were, and, conversely, some of those born in the U.S. are not Federally-affiliated. Guam has written to the Bureau for clarification of this assumption, and received a reply that differs greatly from the methodology given in the report. We are not sure which methodology is being used to derive the base population of Federally-affiliated persons, but we would rather use administrative records than Census data.

2). Net alien immigration figures used in the estimates are based on the number of persons accepted for permanent residence in the United States. According to the report, about 40 percent of the immigrants each year are assumed to leave Guam or inaccurately report their intention of living on Guam. This 40 percent figure is based on data derived from actual versus expected changes in the alien population between 1970 and 1980, and annual alien registration data last collected by the Immigration and Naturalization Service in 1982, and is considered by Guam to be outdated. We suggest that more accurate

records on the movement of aliens be collected by the INS, if it is not collected already, and this data be reported to or shared with the Bureau so that a better estimate of net alien immigration can be compiled. If the data on alien movements are already collected and available, we would like to see the Bureau update their methodology for net alien immigration.

No estimates of net migration for the non-Federally-affiliated population are attempted in the Bureau's estimates as it is "not thought to be large". Guam disagrees with this assumption. We believe that net immigration from the Freely Associated States of Micronesia has increased since the signing of the Compacts of Free Association in 1985. While we do not have a mechanism in place to monitor this immigration, we believe that it has hampered our ability to more accurately estimate and project our population. Our current projections are based on the exponential rate of growth between the 1970 and 1980 Census populations, with the assumptions that the rate of growth has not changed, and that the population is closed to migration. Our projections are understood to be low projections; the Census Bureau estimates are understood by Guam to be high estimates: they acknowledge that the estimates for 1980 were overestimated by 10 percent. As the are using the same methodology, Guam believes that the current estimates are also overestimated by 10 percent.

With no mechanism to monitor migration of the non-Federally-affiliated population, Guam does not project its population for more than a decade at a time after a Census. The flow of migration, coupled with the changes in the military population which are not affected by natural laws (i.e., birth and death rates), are components that are difficult to quantify. It is hoped that if Guam's request for separate tabulations of military and civilian data in the 1990 Census is honored, and a proposed migration monitoring project is instituted by the local government, population estimates and projections for the civilian and total populations may be computed in the future with more accuracy and reliability than in the past.

Mr. DYMALLY. Samoa?

STATEMENT OF FAYE UNTALON MUNOZ, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH, UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Ms. MUNOZ. I am not on the schedule, but I feel that because of the tremendous impact on the importance of this meeting that I have made arrangements to make a very brief presentation.

I worked on the 1980 census for Asian and Pacific Islanders while I resided in the State of California in Los Angeles County.

I am concerned about the census for several reasons. Some of these concerns extend beyond the islands themselves which may be a primary concern of most here today.

My concern probably reflects more of that of a social scientist rather than that of a politician. These concerns are affected also by the national census as well.

The rapid changes—that is the rapid changes in the territories—are a very major concern that I think many people have not been cognizant or have taken serious concern about.

Inappropriate and inadequate methods of collecting population data may cause serious problems in the future in accounting for the indigenous populations of these territories.

Take, for example, Hawaii and the problems of identifying and counting Hawaiians as a race. The territory of Guam is losing that kind of monitoring and surveillance of its indigenous population.

Second, the increasing out-migration of the islanders and the increasing in-migration from Southeast Asia and other parts of the world are causing a tremendous flux in the demographic characteristics of the territories.

I think Guam is experiencing this at a higher level than perhaps the other islands; on the other hand, the other islands would be affected in the same way as Guam is now, only to come at a later time.

The inability for us to monitor and maintain some type of surveillance of the islands' indigenous groups, I think, is a very, very serious problem for many groups.

This brings me to the concern that the 1990 census, for the national census, has decided not to exclude the listing of Pacific Islanders as it was in 1980, which was the first time that the islanders were ever counted in the national census.

It would have at least given us a decade to review and examine the trend and pattern of this kind of migration to the United States of some Pacific Islanders, in particular Chamorros of Guam and Samoans. It would give us some kind of comparable data to evaluate these trends and develop appropriate social planning.

I think it was a serious mistake of the Census Bureau and the U.S. Government to ignore such important social data which could be so helpful to the territories and to knowledge of Pacific Islanders social, economic, health and political status.

I think it should have been kept for at least a decade to compare the data for that period.

The third point I would like to make is that as was mentioned earlier, the census is used for taxing and other kinds of resource distribution measures.

Lack of consistent and uniform systems for data collection on the islands precludes any kind of comparable analysis of needs and resources that will provide some kind of equitable allocation of resources throughout U.S. jurisdictions.

I think these are major concerns and I hope this committee will take a sensitive and constructive approach so that the welfare of Pacific people are not lost in the midst of national priorities.

Mr. DYMALLY. I just want to reassure you the Members of Congress spend a great deal of time with the Census Bureau on the Asian and Pacific Islander question. There were fierce closed door battles.

Mr. AKAKA. And Mr. Matusi was present to include the subgroups in Asia and the Pacific Islands. Unfortunately, we lost that battle.

Ms. MUNOZ. There have been many studies that the census has done looking at certain special groups and certain special kinds of activities. What is the feasibility of doing a special study of Pacific Islanders? If they did it in one state which would be the State of California, you would have captured more than 80 percent of the Pacific population in the mainland.

In 1980 the census showed that there were a little over 30,000 so-called Guamanians that have identified themselves in the 1980 census, more than 75 percent of them were in California. It is true they are found throughout the country. I have done an analysis of the demographic characteristics of that population for the 1980 group and look forward to the 1990 census to make that comparison.

Or, would it be possible for the Congress to request that a special study be done on the Pacific Islanders in the United States?

Mr. DYMALLY. Why don't you write the committee a letter, detailing your proposal to us, and we will take it up with the Census Bureau.

One question, two subparts. You talk about out migration. To where? And in migration, from where?

Ms. MUNOZ. The out-migration are primarily people from Guam, and from American Samoa who have been migrating to the U.S. I did a study for my dissertation at the University of California at Los Angeles on migration of Pacific Islanders to the U.S. During the 1960's, it was a high period of out migration. Many left the islands and moved to California and Hawaii.

For people from Guam, the primary port of entry is California. These migrations have certainly altered the demographic profile of the islands' populations.

If the census statistics were true that on Guam the indigenous Chamorros population is decreasing percentage wise of the total, then we are going to be looking at a larger number of Chamorros in California than that residing on their native Island of Guam.

The in migration are coming largely from Southeast Asia, from the Philippines, Korea, Taiwan, and other countries as well as from other islands in the Pacific. This is a large population of people from the other Micronesia and Palau who come to the university for education and remained.

Mr. DYMALLY. Any from Southeast Asia?

Ms. MUNOZ. Yes. We have, since the Vietnam relocation there are some Southeast Asian groups in Guam. I don't want to subvert my colleague from Guam, but the issue of bilingualism is a problem on Guam. Like Hawaii we have not only Southeast Asians, native Chamorros, Filipinos, Palauians and other Micronesian groups.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman?

Mr. AKAKA. No questions.

Mrs. SAIKI. No questions.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much for your testimony.

STATEMENT OF JOHN FAUMUINA, DEPUTY DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. FAUMUINA. Good morning. Talofa.

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, members of the Bureau of the Census, I am John Faumuina, deputy director of the Office of Economic Development and Planning and also the Chairman of the Census Interagency Committee of the Government of American Samoa.

I formally submit this testimony to the Subcommittee on Census and Population for the record.

The American Samoa Census Interagency Committee, established under Governor A.P. Lutali general memorandum number 95–1986, coordinated with the Bureau of Census in Washington, the development and planning of the upcoming 1990 Census. The committee advises the Governor on matters pertaining to the questionnaire contents and issues unique to the social/cultural environment of the territory. The Interagency committee is chaired by myself. Committee members include one member from the general public and representatives from the following American Samoan Government agencies: Human Resources, Health and Medical Services, Education, Public Safety, Agriculture, American Samoa Community College Land Grant Program, Immigration, Election Office, Energy Office, Public Works Housing Division.

Our relationship with the Bureau of Census has improved favorably in the past few years. Since the initiation of the Census Interagency Committee, two meetings have been held with visiting officials from the Bureau of Census. The first meeting was held on January 30, 1987, to discuss the contents of the questionnaire. A follow-up meeting was held on August 15, 1988. It is very encouraging to see greater participation of our local government in the development and planning of our next census, however, at times the American Samoan Government is not made aware of major decisions affecting our census. As the only U.S. possession south of the equator, we must continually strive to improve communications with Washington, D.C.

My testimony to the subcommittee present major concerns critical to improving the census project for American Samoa.

Outreach Program. In order to insure a complete and accurate census, the population to be surveyed should be well informed of the purpose, the importance and the technicality of the project. Samoan people are very appreciative of any projects which promote their community awareness and information about their culture.

Our residents are eager to participate if they are aware of what is being accomplished. However, they may be hesitant if they are not informed of the program in advance and do not see the results of the project in a timely fashion. A technical project, such as the census, requires promotional efforts to gain the meaningful participation of the population.

From past census experiences, the outreach programs prepared in Washington were discarded and unused because of the differences in the audience here in American Samoa. I would like to recommend to the subcommittee that the Bureau of Census submit the outreach program materials in ample lead time for the local Census Interagency Committee to review the program and provide comments. The outreach materials should also be made available in the Samoan language for the benefit of our non-English speaking population. All final outreach program materials should be geared specifically for our territory.

Mapping Programs and Geographic Coverage. A new mapping system, TIGER files were created by the Bureau of Census for the 1990 enumerations using Block Numbering Areas and Block Groups. This new mapping program was specifically designed for the states. The Territory of American Samoa, with its flexible county and village boundaries, must adapt to this program.

In a letter from the Bureau of Census to our Governor dated April 28, 1986, we were told that the new mapping programs will be used in the states and that it will be on a voluntary basis for us. We accepted the new programs but we strongly recommended maintaining boundaries similar to the Enumeration Districts established for previous censuses. In the preparations of BNAs and BGs, we find it difficult to follow guidelines established by the Bureau for delineation of boundaries, and in most cases, we have to use "feature extensions" or imaginary lines for delineating county and village boundaries.

Our most critical concern in this area is the presentation of data. The data should be comparable with previous censuses and geographic tabulations should not be affected by the new boundary distributions.

Questionnaire Content. Questionnaire content is a very sensitive and important issue for American Samoa because of the uniqueness of our cultural setting and our isolated location in the South Pacific Region. As stated earlier, two meetings have been conducted between the Bureau of Census and the local Census Interagency Committee, in which the questionnaire proposal was commented upon and recommendations were made. A detailed outline of issues of special concern to us and of common interest to the American Flag Pacific Islands (AFPI) were discussed at a Pacific Basin Development Council meeting. Follow-up discussions regarding these issues were also held at the East-West Center in Hawaii, during a recent AFPI statistical training.

An issue often raised by the participants in these discussions was the comparability of census data among the Pacific Territories as well as the states. The idea of a single questionnaire was recommended because it would save time and money and allow data comparability among the territories. We would like to maintain one

questionnaire for the sake of smooth planning, faster data processing and data comparability.

We have not yet seen the final questionnaire. We strongly recommend that the final full questionnaire package be sent to us for review before printing.

Processing and Tabulation. We are concerned regarding the plans to have the AFPI censuses processed at the International Statistical Program Center (ISPC) of the Bureau of Census. It appears that the ISPC may be taking this on as a pilot project. We are especially concerned whether the editing and checking of our data will be done by the Bureau of Census personnel or the ISPC staff.

In previous censuses, we were not given the opportunity to fully review tabulation schedules prepared by the Bureau of Census. It is important that the Bureau establish a dialogue and correspondence with us in order to effectively implement the data processing of our census. With a small population such as ours, complicated methods of data allocations and imputations are irrelevant. The Interagency Census Committee should be made aware of any major decisions during data processing. Personnel from our local government should be involved directly with data processing, particularly editing and checking of data.

A meeting for the preparation of the tabulation plans should be initiated earlier next year to discuss the data needs of the territories and the volume of information that can be published.

In the census of 1980, we waited more than five years before we received any official data on social-economic characteristics of our population. It is critical to our economic development and social services planning, that we receive the information in a more timely manner for the 1990 census.

Participation in other programs. Title 13 of the U.S. Code required taking censuses of the states and territories. We have been included in other special census such as the economic census. The census of agriculture is attached together with the population and housing census, while in the states it is done two years before the population and housing census. I strongly recommend that the Territory of American Samoa be included in the economic census program. The dates for the agricultural census should be rescheduled to coincide with the United States and other territories.

Another area of importance is the preparation of household surveys for the territories. American Samoa is the only U.S. territory that has implemented a survey program for the collection of supplemental information in mid-decennial period. I suggested that the Bureau of Census assist the local government in the preparation of these surveys since we are not included in the Current Population Survey Program.

Summary. The government of American Samoa fully appreciates the effort that has been made thus far in preparation for the 1990 census. There is still much to be prepared and finalized. We have not received an outreach program nor have we been consulted on how the program will be adapted to our unique circumstances. We also have concerns regarding processing and tabulation.

The American Samoa Government hopes that we are able to build upon our good working relationship with the Bureau of

Census. We are a remote territory and realize the difficulties associated with communication. However, in order to have the best possible census project in 1990, we must continue to improve communications with Washington, D.C. and insure our unique characteristics are addressed.

Thank you very much. Faafetai tele lava ma ia manuia le tausaga fou. Happy new year to you all.

Mr. DYMALLY. Merci beaucoup.

The Interagency Committee which you have in Samoa, are there federal representatives on that committee or just state representatives?

Mr. FAUMUINA. They are all local representatives.

Mr. DYMALLY. You don't have a census representative on the island?

Mr. FAUMUINA. No, sir.

Mr. DYMALLY. All of the communication is done either by your visits to Washington, or the Census Bureau visits to American Samoa?

Mr. FAUMUINA. A group came down twice.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman?

Mr. AKAKA. Yes. Again, my interest in your total population, what is the population presently and what is your projection?

Mr. FAUMUINA. It is about 38,000 at this time. By the year 2000, we are looking at about 50,000 to 60,000.

Mr. DYMALLY. Is that natural growth or in-migration?

Mr. FAUMUINA. Both.

Mr. DYMALLY. Where do your new migrants come from?

Mr. FAUMUINA. From various islands in the region. We have immigrants from Western Samoa, Tonga, etc.; some from the Asian countries, like the Philippines, Taiwanese.

Mr. AKAKA. Where do most of your people migrate?

Mr. FAUMUINA. Fortunately, Congressman, to Hawaii and to the West Coast.

Mr. DYMALLY. I think the 31st District which I represent has more Samoans than you have on your island.

Mr. FAUMUINA. Probably so.

Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much.

All the great football players of Samoa originally come from my district.

STATEMENT OF JOYCE KAHANE, PLANNING OFFICER, OFFICE OF HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS; PAT LUCE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SAMOAN AFFAIRS; AND JERRY B. NORRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PACIFIC BASIN DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Ms. KAHANE. Good morning. I am Joyce Kahane, planning officer of the Office of Hawaiian Affairs. I will be presenting this testimony for our administrator, Mr. Kanahele. The Office of Hawaiian Affairs is most grateful for this opportunity to submit written testimony regarding the census which will become a part of the record.

As you know, the Office of Hawaiian Affairs (OHA) is governed by an elected nine-member Board of Trustees. The trustees are required to be of Native Hawaiian descent, and are elected by eligible

voters who also must be of Native Hawaiian ancestry. As a result, the OHA trustees are directly accountable to their beneficiaries, the Native Hawaiian people.

OHA was created in 1978 by an amendment to the Hawaii State Constitution. The basis for its establishment, however, dates back to our State Admission Act of 1959. The Act created a public land trust, the process of which were to be used for five purposes. One of the purposes was the betterment of conditions for Native Hawaiians.

In 1979, the State Legislature passed Act 196 which established the basic structure of OHA. This Act, subsequently codified as chapter 10, Hawaii Revised Statutes, set out the basic purposes, powers, and duties of OHA. Chapter 10 established OHA as the "principal public agency in this State responsible for performance, development, and coordination of programs and activities" relating to Native Hawaiians. Chapter 10 also provides that OHA serve as a receptacle for reparations and act as a clearinghouse for applications for federal or state assistance involving Native Hawaiian programs and projects. OHA also is to advise and inform federal, state, and county officials about Native Hawaiian programs. It is with this in mind that OHA submits testimony today.

Over the years, OHA has been a strong advocate of a 1990 United States decennial census which will accurately represent the Native Hawaiian population. Two major areas of concern for OHA have been: obtaining an accurate count of Native Hawaiians; and reclassifying Native Hawaiians as Native Americans.

With regard to our first concern, OHA has contended that the United States Census Bureau's decennial census has underestimated the number of Native Hawaiians. The Census Bureau's 1980 count of Native Hawaiians is lower than figures obtained locally by the State of Hawaii's Department of Health. This appears to be due to the fact that the state Department of Health allowed for coding of up to three ethnicities of the respondent.

As you are very much aware, accurate identification of ethnic mixes is especially critical in the State of Hawaii where approximately 30 percent of all residents are of mixed ancestry. Of these, over 60 percent are Native Hawaiian. About 20 percent of the State of Hawaii's entire population is Native Hawaiian. Therefore, we continue to recommend that the Bureau of Census code at least three responses to the ancestry question, to allow for more accurate enumeration of Native Hawaiians.

With regard to our second concern, OHA has been a strong proponent for Native Hawaiians being classified with other Native Americans. We oppose the current inclusion of Native Hawaiians with Asians and other Pacific Islanders, primarily because all the other groups in this category are immigrants to the United States, and Native Hawaiians are increasingly being included in federal programs for Native Americans and are the subject of legislation based on native status. Therefore, the Bureau of the Census should be consistent with other federal agencies and programs that designate Native Hawaiians as Native Americans. We continue to urge the Census Bureau to reevaluate Statistical Policy Directive No. 15, issued by the Office of Management and Budget, which provides

96-116 O - 89 - 3

the standards of ethnic and racial categories for statistical reporting used by all federal agencies.

Because of concerns such as those discussed above, that is, that there be an accurate count of Native Hawaiians, we strongly support the Bureau's outreach efforts, particularly those that will be directed to Native Hawaiians.

We believe that a check-off survey format for the census, where specific categories are listed, including "Native Hawaiian", and checked by individuals in recognition of their status, is more likely to obtain an accurate count of Native Hawaiians. This is preferable to a write-in format, which lists "Hawaiian" as an example under the Asian or Pacific Islander category. However, we understand that the latter write-in format will be used for the 1990 census. It is our hope that the inclusion of "Hawaiian" as a specific example will assist Native Hawaiians to respond appropriately. However, we strongly urge the Census Bureau to include as part of its outreach program instructing Native Hawaiians how to properly fill in the write-in portions of the race and ancestry questions, to promote a more precise quantification of Native Hawaiians.

We also contend that it is essential that the outreach and promotional activities of the Census Bureau inform Native Hawaiians about the importance of responding to the census survey and of the ramifications of the census for Native Hawaiians.

We understand that the Census Bureau has planned an outreach and promotional campaign using the mass media to inform and educate the public about the 1990 census, utilizing the services of minority-oriented advertising firms. We encourage the Census Bureau to select advertising firms that also will be aware of and sensitive to the needs of Native Hawaiians as they relate to the census, and that will be able to effectively translate the process of the census to Native Hawaiians.

Moreover, for its outreach campaign, we urge the Bureau to recruit and hire Native Hawaiians who will have an understanding of, a sensitivity to, and an ability to establish good rapport with people in the Native Hawaiian community. Efforts also should be made to recruit and hire Native Hawaiians to conduct follow-up activities within predominantly Hawaiian communities.

In closing, we continue to urge the Census Bureau to allow for coding of at least three responses on its ancestry question, which will generate more accurate data on the number of Native Hawaiians, and to reclassify Native Hawaiians with other native Americans as a more appropriate grouping. We congratulate the Census Bureau in its outreach and promotional efforts. However, we request that the Bureau specifically include Native Hawaiians in its activities, so that a more accurate count of Native Hawaiians will be generated for this 1990 census. We greatly appreciate this opportunity to submit testimony on this matter.

Mr. DYMALLY. Ms. Kahane, one of the benefits of these hearings is that you get updated on the latest trends in ethnicity. For example, the in-thing now is not black; it is African-American. It is not Afro-American, it is African American. You only find out these things when you go to conventions or hearings.

I would like you to go back to the section you dealt with about native Hawaiians and native Americans. Give me an explanation

of what you want the Census Bureau to do. Do you classify native Hawaiians as native Americans?

Ms. KAHANE. Yes. OHA has supported this for a number of years because native Hawaiians are originally peoples of this country as are other native Americans. Therefore, OHA has supported classification, the grouping of native Hawaiians as native Americans rather than in the Pacific Islander and Asian category.

Mr. DYMALLY. So they would not be listed under a subgroup of Pacific Islanders, but as an independent group?

Ms. KAHANE. Under the category of native American.

Mr. DYMALLY. Yes. Would there not be some confusion. American Indians sometimes want to be listed as native Americans. Would there be any distinction about American Indians as compared to native Hawaiians? How would we be able to differentiate for statistical purposes those of Hawaiian origin and those of American origin?

Ms. KAHANE. Hopefully, there would be a specific category native Hawaiian. That would separate native Hawaiians out. It would be native Hawaiians that would be in the category of native Americans.

Mr. DYMALLY. I see. You would have a section of native Americans with two subgroups: American Indians, native Hawaiians? There would be a new category, so to speak, rather than listing them under Pacific Islanders?

Ms. KAHANE. Exactly.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman?

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you. Thank you very much. What is your reading on the Hawaiian population at this moment?

Ms. KAHANE. Well, this is why we are really supporting the census and its work. It is difficult to get accurate demographic material on the native Hawaiian population. As I stated in the—as was stated in the testimony, we currently have two enumerations for native Hawaiian population. In the 1980 census, for example, the Bureau of Census count was 136,000. The Department of Health in the State of Hawaii, in the same year, counted 165,000 native Hawaiians. Those are roughly the kinds of figures that we are looking at. We support the census in its work. We would like to have a more accurate count to work with.

Mr. AKAKA. In trying to reach an accurate count, you suggested in your testimony there should be three responses to the ancestry question. Can you elaborate for me what the three responses would be?

Ms. KAHANE. Not that there would be three responses but that the Bureau would count at least three so that if a respondent responded Hawaiian as one of the responses, perhaps there would be three or numerous responses to that question, that there would be a possibility that Hawaiian would be counted. There would be more possibility of that with the counting of three at least for that question.

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much.

Mr. Barcinas, is the testimony you gave similar to the statement submitted by the Governor?

Mr. BARCINAS. Yes. I read a summary of the longer version.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mrs. Pat Luce.

STATEMENT OF PAT LUCE, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF SAMOAN AFFAIRS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Akaka, I am here from California, but I am American Samoan, Pacific Islander. I am here in response to your invitation.

The 1990 census is nearing and yet the importance of the census has not impacted the core of our communities and populations. Data users, policy-makers are most aware of the importance. Federal monies going to the State and local government are all based on the census count. Services planned for populations and regions are determined by the census count.

Interest in the Samoan community has been growing during the past several years as policy-makers and planners have become more aware of the many minority groups in the country. There is little data published about Samoan and Pacific Islanders. Most people in the States know little about this Polynesian population.

Though the emphasis of the hearing is particularly on the territories and the State of Hawaii, due to the migratory nature of our population, it is important to be aware of the following: Since the early 1950s, Samoan migration to Hawaii and the U.S. Mainland seems to have generated its own momentum. From the early beginning, sizable Samoan communities have developed in Honolulu, San Francisco, San Diego and the Seattle Metropolitan areas. While some Samoans have taken up stable residence in these various metropolitan areas, the population as a whole is characterized by the circular migration pattern, trends, among the Samoan community in the United States. Many Samoans spend brief or longer periods of time in residence in the Samoan Islands subsequent to their initial residence in the United States.

Household memberships fluctuate as individuals visit back and forth trying their luck in the United States labor market and failing that, returning to Samoa for a time. Obligations to family, community, and church—all of which encompass the move—are often the reasons for this migration.

To date, it has been impossible to determine the exact number of Samoans in Hawaii and the Continental United States. The U.S. Census of 1980 enumerated 41,948 Samoans in the United States. The census provided the first actual count of Samoans in at least 50 years of migration to the United States, and it is the first census to describe the demographic and social economic characteristics of this migrant group.

I believe that one of the issues brought forth in the 1980 census was that the Samoan population was next to the Vietnamese in the area of economic needs. It is one that we were hoping to be able to make comparison whether that area has improved or remained stable; but we question that with the way the race issue is going at this time.

There continues to be a lingering concern among Samoans about the 1980 census. The data nevertheless provides the most comprehensive information available about Samoans residing in the United States. There has been much debate and speculation on the

accuracy of 1980 Samoan population figures. For the 1980 census, Samoans were listed as a separate category for ethnic identification. The 1970 U.S. census grouped Samoans under "others".

Additional characteristics included Pacific Islanders, Asian, Asian others, minority others, non-white others, others, others, not applicable and no.

Being others for the past 50 years, Samoans have been an invisible, unheard and neglected minority group. In relationship to others—improving the census count is a focal mission for the 1990 census for our community, and we know that this is also the mission of the census. How to arrive at this is the question.

The race issue, which we greatly want to thank the sponsors, I know Congressman Akaka and many of the other congressional supporters, for diligently supporting the communities most concerned as to how this particular issue was addressed. At this period of time, we are unsure what is happening and whether it will be pursued; but we feel that—we question the success to improve the accurate count if we use the right form, particularly for the language population groups, particularly for the hardly enumerated population, and the only recourse we have now, we have been asked and we are aware of the great outreach plan that is being proposed by the Census Bureau.

The question is how successful will this outreach plan address our population in the language population, if there is a need there. We are committed to support the Census Bureau. But again we can only do so much. We are aware of the language centers that are being established. We are also aware that a proposed plan of using national networks, which the Pacific Communities do not utilize, is also being proposed.

So much of the success of the outreach plan is determined by whether they are ready to recognize the cultural structures of the various Pacific Island populations, whether they are ready to recognize the communication systems that are utilized within our population. Many of the proposed plans are standardized and recognized by the larger minority groups, but they are not unique within our population. So we feel there needs to be ongoing and close communications in order for the whole enumeration process to be successful.

We also have a concern and one of understanding the status definitions of our Pacific Islanders, our territories. As I identified earlier, we have the migratory patterns within the American Samoan population. There are times when we are recognized by Congress as part of the U.S., and there are times that we almost feel like we are Asians. At times when we are lumped together with the Asians, we totally feel that we are not properly addressed because we are so small in numbers and we are lost in that fold.

The recommendation that has been made, and again I would note the status of lumping us into one total count totally defuses the recognition and needs of each of the specific groups within the category known as Asian Pacific Islanders. We hope you will support us in again considering the race issue or using another means to assure that there will be an accurate count from within our communities.

Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Ms. Luce, I am glad you said you were from California. For a while, I thought there was a twin sister here. I kept saying to myself, this face is familiar. Anyhow, it is good to see you.

I wanted to just ask you a question about a matter that is not directly related to the census, but is related to the Samoan population. When you visit the United States, you have a passport, isn't that right? When you leave Samoa, you come with a passport?

Mrs. LUCE. We don't need a passport. But a passport is convenient just for walking through Hawaii.

Mr. DYMALLY. In other words, you are not American citizens, you are American residents?

Mrs. LUCE. American nationals. We are entitled to all the rights of a U.S. citizen except for voting, and we are hoping that you will address that issue soon.

Mr. DYMALLY. Yes, indeed. Mr. Walter Fauntroy, I am sure, is working on it right now.

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. DYMALLY. But children born of Samoan parents State-side are automatically American citizens?

Mrs. LUCE. That is right.

Mr. DYMALLY. What happens if a Samoan national wants to become an American citizen? What is the procedure one has to go through?

Mrs. LUCE. It is the same procedure of obtaining naturalization.

Mr. DYMALLY. I recall the legislation to do away with that. I understand there is still some misgivings about it in Samoa. Not everybody supports that piece of legislation.

Mrs. LUCE. I think we will. We will talk to you again on the Hill.

Mr. DYMALLY. Very good. Mr. Akaka.

Mr. AKAKA. Mrs. Luce, you are a resident of California?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes, I am.

Mr. AKAKA. Where is this Office of Samoan Affairs located?

Mrs. LUCE. In San Francisco.

Mr. AKAKA. I see. But your focus and concern is for all of the Samoan people, including those in Samoa?

Mrs. LUCE. Yes.

Mr. AKAKA. I was interested in your comments about the migration out of Samoa of some monies to the Mainland and that they have really mpacted California and some other states as well.

Your interest in getting accurate counts of the Samoans, I am sure, is to help you in your type of programs in the future for the Samoans who are state-side as well as in Samoa.

Do you have any projections of programs from your office that would help the Samoans if you get this accurate count?

Mrs. LUCE. The term is broad, but it is one of self sufficiency, which means in the areas of developing the economic base of our population, areas of employment, and as I stated earlier from the 1980 census, the profiles there, the social profiles, showed a low level of attainment in education and economic needs. We are looking at educational kinds of programs, programs that address the health needs of our population.

We have, as I am sure the Congressman is aware, in this region a rising of gangs in those particular areas with the youth. There

are many, many types of things associated with economic needs. Those are the kinds of programs.

Mr. DYMALLY. What about senior citizens? Is there a rising senior citizen population among Samoans in California?

Mrs. LUCE. There exists a population, but again I am using the 1980 data. Our population has a mean age of 19. I have Mike Levin here who—I am quoting things I am using from their data. We are a young population. We do have needs within the elderly groups. Our people, along with many of the ethnic groups, other ethnic groups, are ones that have taken care of their elderly. But there are new elements entering into that.

Mr. DYMALLY. I do share your concern because Samoans seem to fall between the cracks when it comes to training programs, and a number of other programs. These statistical bits of information are very important to really bring to school districts.

For example, the Samoan population in Compton has increased. I am not so sure Carson knows how many Samoan students they have there.

Mrs. LUCE. We are very pleased with the success of the 1980 census for the first time, being able to identify our population.

The last meeting that was held in Washington, D.C. on the race issue, we even took recommendations—we recommended it be taken down to the block level of information. We know that there is little information, even at the local areas, for planning purposes. It is important to have this kind of data.

Mr. AKAKA. May I comment that in relation to your comment about sometimes feeling that the United States is not giving you proper attention, that the United States is, I would say, because you now have a Congressman who represents Samoa. That Congressman, like the gentleman from Washington, D.C., and Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and Guam, represents the people of Samoa. That is the person that you can depend on in carrying your concerns to Congress. So I would urge you to make use of that representative.

Mrs. LUCE. Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much, Ms. Luce. Mr. Norris?

STATEMENT OF JERRY B. NORRIS, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PACIFIC BASIN DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Akaka, I am Jerry B. Norris, Director of the Pacific Basin Development Council, whose Board of Directors consist of the Governors of American Samoa, Guam, the Northern Marianas and the State of Hawaii.

On August 22, 1988 the most recent board meeting of the Council hosted by the Governor of Hawaii, the Governor of Guam took the lead on the census issues and communicated the concerns of all four Governors to the Hawaiian Congressional Delegation, to you, to the U.S. Bureau of Census.

There are two areas I would like to visit with you about if I may with regards to the American Samoan situation. In 1984 through the efforts of Congressman Sunia, and again with the support of the Hawaii Congressional Delegation and the support of the U.S. Department of HUD, we made an effort to break out the 1980

census data figures for Samoa so they could qualify for the HUD Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) program.

With everybody in agreement and no opposition, it took a total of 17 months to have that information run and provided to the government.

The general observation was made by many, because the territories do not use census information to redistrict and reapportion, the Territories and Commonwealths tend to be on the lower end of the totem pole and, therefore, are last priority in running the Census information.

In the Compact of Free Association, which is a Compact approved by the United States Congress and signed by the President, there is a section within the Compact that mandates that if any adverse impact is found because of the implementation of the Compact to American Samoa, Guam, Northern Marianas, Hawaii or Alaska, the Congress is authorized to appropriate funds to mitigate that impact.

The problem we are having now is there is no way, with the current census data, that we can track the F.A.S. citizens coming into the Pacific Islands or the State of Alaska. Once they are in our island community, there is no way to identify them for enabling or entitlement programs on either the local or Federal level.

The third area that I think Congressman Akaka knows about—the senior Senator from the State of Hawaii has been working hard to open up specialized programs to Pacific Islanders. Unless there is a way to count those people, be it on their respective islands or the U.S. Mainland, to get the proper benefits for those programs would be almost impossible.

I have no further comments and would be happy to respond to questions.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Norris, where are your headquarters?

Mr. NORRIS. We are headquartered here in Honolulu.

Mr. DYMALLY. You travel to the territories?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman?

Mr. AKAKA. Jerry, good to see you again.

I know that you have been with the Pacific Basin Development Council for a few years now, and if anyone has the pulse beat of the Pacific area, I feel you are one of those persons. As you alluded to, the census statistics will make a big difference in what can happen in the Pacific area.

In light of your knowledge of the population of the governments out in the Pacific, what would you recommend to the Census Bureau in carrying out a program in the Pacific to get the most accurate counts?

As you know, we have had this bill, 4432, that was not signed by the President, and we thought that would help. Would you comment on that bill or any recommendations you may have?

Mr. NORRIS. With regard to the bill, Congressman Akaka, I think we are all very disappointed that it did not pass. We were particularly appreciative of your support and Congresswoman Saiki's support in those efforts.

Following the August 22 meeting of the four Governors, where they went on record raising concerns, there was a workshop con-

vened herewith the total cooperation of the U.S. Department of Census and also the Office of U.S. Territorial and International Affairs. In that workshop, both generic and general issues of commonality were addressed as well as individual concerns.

I think clearly the census needs to pay attention to those working groups established on each one of the islands. I would make a suggestion that those working groups could come together on occasion because as in both the testimony here and in internal documents we have seen from each of the Governors, there is a need to have general specific questions addressed by all the islanders.

There are also unique and specific needs of the islanders. We find more and more Federal programs, for example, in the unemployment areas, and where the Economic Development Administration is saying to Guam, "We will not put in capital improvement projects because your unemployment rate is not double-digit", yet in the territories, where you have partial subsistence, the question must be asked, what is under-employment or unemployment or non-employment? If somebody isn't going out and necessarily catching fish or growing taro, does that make them employed or unemployed? You have to pay attention to specific islander issues.

As you get these programs into place, unless you can count islanders, you are spreading a limited resource with a much smaller cut of the pie. Listening to those groups and realizing the special set of circumstances would be of high priority.

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much, indeed.

Now the Census Bureau. Mr. Bounpane, I know you have been taking notes. Your testimony might respond to some of the concerns raised by our friends.

STATEMENT OF PETER BOUNPANE, ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR DECENNIAL CENSUS, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Mr. BOUNPANE. I ran out of paper. Good morning. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee for this opportunity.

With your permission, I would like to submit the full testimony for the record and do a brief summary now and then to do what you just asked, which is to try to respond to some of the concerns raised by the other witnesses here this morning.

Mr. DYMALLY. Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. BOUNPANE. As you know, Census Day, April 1, 1990 is fast approaching. As we reported to you on September 27, the Census preparatory activities are well underway. What I would like to do is say a few words about those activities in Hawaii and then a few words about those activities in the Pacific Islands.

Starting first with Hawaii. Overall management and support for the census of Hawaii will be provided by our Regional Census Center in Seattle, Washington. Mr. Leo Schilling, our Regional Director, is here with us today. Unfortunately, he parked at a parking meter outside and just left to make sure he put more quarters in to be sure he didn't get a ticket.

To conduct the census for Hawaii, we plan to establish two temporary district offices, one here in Honolulu and one in Waipahu.

However, the managers and all other personnel for census operations are going to be hired locally. So that means on the out-islands you would hire people from the out-islands to conduct the census there. We will conduct the census in Hawaii much as we do elsewhere in the country. For about 92 percent of the housing units, we will use the mail-out/mail-back census procedure. For the balance, we will use the door-to-door procedure.

To conduct the census, we will need to hire, train, and retain a large high-quality work force. It will require about 2,000 persons with about 900 of them working at the peak of the operations in April and May 1990. As in the mainland, it is going to be a challenge to recruit sufficient numbers of employees. To give us a better chance to do so we are asking for the support of local governments and organizations. We however are strengthening our enumerator training, our enumerator pay and our enumerator management procedures to help us reduce the high turnover we experienced in previous censuses and to improve the quality of the work done.

Let me say a few words about the promotion and outreach efforts. For the 1990 census, as you know, we plan an extensive multifaceted promotion campaign. It is going to be a combination of a major national effort with the opportunity for modification and additions at the local level. For the first time, we have asked the Advertising Council to arrange for the services of minority advertising agencies to supplement the general advertising campaign and to appeal more directly to minority audiences. The Advertising Council just recently selected and signed Muse-Cordero-Chen, Incorporated to design a TV, radio and newspaper campaign for Asian audiences.

In addition to the general audience and Asian campaigns, there will be campaigns aimed at the Black population and the Hispanic population.

Another important part of our outreach activity is the census education project, which is aimed at promoting the awareness and knowledge of the census among schoolchildren who in turn will pass that awareness and knowledge on to their parents. The census education project materials will be sent to the schools in March of 1989. That is ten months earlier than for the 1980 census. This will give educators time to build the materials into their curricula and to customize the lesson activities as necessary. We also will seek to motivate local community action groups to support the census by encouraging their members and clients to be included. We do this through one-on-one contacts between our community awareness specialists and the community groups. We already have one community awareness specialist working full time in Hawaii and we plan to have an additional person working here by early next year.

Next let me say a few words about joint participation between the Census Bureau and local governments. We have instituted a number of new programs and improved some of our 1980 census programs to increase joint cooperation between the Census Bureau and local governments. In particular, we are asking local officials to help us make the census better in six ways. One, to promote the census and build public cooperation. Two, to identify good candidates for temporary census jobs. Three, to help us find free or low

cost space for local census operations. Four, to review our preliminary census totals. Five, to assist in special situations. One of these we already discussed this morning. That is, the homeless situation. We are going to need local authorities to help us identify shelters and places where the homeless congregate so we can count them properly.

Lastly, we are going to need local officials to promptly and accurately answer the boundary and annexation survey we conduct every year in January because if we do not have the boundaries of their locality reflected properly, then we cannot tabulate the census properly.

Of these six, I think local promotion is one of the keys to a successful census. I wanted to give an idea of the kinds of things that might be done locally in Hawaii to supplement what we are doing nationally.

You could consider a census float in conjunction with Aloha Day, sponsor a special census event at the Waikiki shell, tape public service announcements by local entertainers, or local elected officials, air special census shows on local TV and radio networks, or distribute flyers at the state fair here in Hawaii.

These are not all of them, but they're illustrative of the kinds of things we would hope localities would try to do to supplement what we are doing on a national basis. We are willing to work with them to help them accomplish those goals.

Before I go on to the Pacific Islands, Mr. Schilling has returned. Let me point out Leo Schilling, the Director of our Seattle Regional——

Mr. DYMALLY. Did he get a ticket or not?

Mr. BOUNPANE. Let me turn now to a few words about the Pacific Islands.

As in past censuses, the governments of the Pacific Territories will be responsible for the data collection phase of the census. And the Census Bureau will be responsible for the overall planning, data processing, tabulation, and publication phases. However, the Census Bureau will cover all of the costs of the census in the Pacific Territories including data collection. We have been working closely with the governments to plan the censuses in their areas. The questionnaires for the Pacific Territories are different from those used in the fifty states in order to meet the different data needs for these areas. In 1986, we asked each of those governments to appoint a lead agency to organize and chair interagency working groups to make recommendations on the content of the census questionnaires. I would like to take this opportunity to say how grateful we are to these interagency working groups and those agency heads, some of whom are here today, for their hard work and their contributions towards that questionnaire development. We are currently reviewing those final recommendations and we are making every effort to incorporate the suggestions that they have made to us. But at the same time, we have to try to make sure that the questionnaire allows for some comparability between islands and also it is somewhat consistent so we can develop a processing system that will allow us to solve some of the problems of timing we experienced in processing the last census. We will transmit shortly the versions of those questionnaires to the governors

and interagency working committees for their final reviews before printing.

As for the census procedure in those areas, it has been discussed already. I would like to reiterate that it is a door to door procedure in each of the three Pacific areas and that there is one questionnaire, not two as in the states, so everyone is asked the longer form of the questionnaire.

We are planning to process the questionnaires for all three areas stateside and right now our plans are to do that in Jeffersonville, Indiana. We are going to process with an integrated microcomputer processing system that is different from the last census. We heard concerns about that decision. I would like to come back to that later on.

What happened with processing for the Pacific areas in 1980? I would like to talk about timing now. In 1980, the questionnaires for the Pacific areas were processed using the same system used for each of the fifty states. Unfortunately, the pacific areas did tend to get pushed to the end of the line in terms of priority. That was one of the major reasons for that five-year delay we heard about. We believe that the use of this new innovative microcomputer processing system will be a great improvement and should expedite greatly the release of 1990 data.

Let me say a few words about promotion in the Pacific Islands. Next spring we expect to submit to each of the areas our proposal for local promotion planning including both publicity and outreach. I don't know exactly what it will say, but I am sure this plan will include advertising, publicity materials, public service announcements with territorial celebrities and dignitaries, news releases, feature stories, press kits and leaflets, pamphlets, decals, bumper stickers, posters and so on. We will attempt to provide as many of these materials as possible, customized for each of the local areas.

The plan and goals of the census education project in the Pacific areas are the same as those in the fifty states. We are, however, adapting materials specifically for use in the Pacific territories. Basically what that means is we are going to add a special lesson to the census education project that will have data that is specific to one of the Pacific territories so the student would not be discussing a lesson about the situation in Iowa or something like that.

We plan to distribute the materials beginning in the summer of 1989 so that they can be built into the school curricula and further adopted as necessary. I mention some other aspects of our proposed promotion in the written testimony.

Let me say a few words in closing from this oral testimony and then go on to some of the concerns raised. One of the biggest challenges we face in planning a decennial census is to develop a system that is basically the same everywhere. We need that "sameness" for control and comparability purposes. But on the other hand, to develop a system that allows modifications locally to allow for what are legitimate local conditions. That is a tough balance to reach. We think we have reached a good balance here. Some may disagree with where we went on some of the issues. Regardless of that, I think we have or are on track with a successful census, both in Hawaii and the Pacific territories in 1990. The success so far

goes to most of the people in both Hawaii and the Pacific Islands who have been so helpful to us so far.

That concludes my summary of the written testimony. I would like to say a few words about some of the issues raised by the other witnesses. Then I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Mr. DYMALLY. Proceed.

Mr. BOUNPANE. First, I would like to talk about the race question. Obviously, that is of concern to many people. As yet, we have made no decision on which version of the question to use. You may wonder why it is so late and we have not yet decided. I will tell you why. But, first, Congressman Dymally, in order to assure you, it is not that we have already gone to the printer and will give you the answer that we can't change it. That is not the case. The questionnaire has not gone to the printer as yet.

Basically, we thought the write-in version of the question was better. When the President vetoed the bill that Congress had passed it should have been straightforward to go forward and use the write-in question. Perhaps we should have already decided that. The reason we haven't done it as yet is that we were very attuned to the concerns raised here today. To make the census successful, we need the support of a lot of people. If we have done something to anger them or turn them off, we have to consider that in any eventual decision we make. We think we made the right one. We would like a chance again to explain that to people. Hopefully, everyone will be as magnanimous as Pat Luce is, who said regardless of where we come down, she will support the census. I think that is going to be needed.

A few more words about that question. We like everybody else want the count to be as accurate as possible, to count every single person. When we tested a new version of the question against the 1980 question, that is exactly what we were aiming towards. We did a testing program in which half of the people got the new question as worded in 1980, and half of the people got the new question, the write-in version. In each of our tests, the write-in version showed up better. Let me explain to you what I mean by that. That is the count of Asian and Pacific Islanders on the write-in version was always at least as high or higher using the write-in question than it was using the listing version. In addition, the non-interview rate, that is people who forgot to answer the question, was lower using the write-in question than in the individual listing question. Now, we don't have definitive answers. We didn't do huge national tests or anything like that. We did test it in many places and we found this finding consistent. I am sorry we have not been able to explain that story properly to people. But our best evidence to date is that the write-in question can work and does work.

Now I won't sit here and say there aren't some people who will have difficulty answering the write-in question. Surely that's the case. To new immigrants, and even to some who have been here a while, how to answer properly is a confusing topic. Some people are going to have trouble answering that question; therefore we intend to produce instructional brochures that would tell the person how to answer the race question. We would like to get those instructional brochures translated into the appropriate languages. We would

like to have them distributed through the appropriate community organizations, and we would like to go to local newspapers, and ask them to print this instruction telling their readers how to answer question four. I hope the instructional brochure occurs no matter which way we decide on the question. It seemed clear from what several people said today that how to answer the race question is difficult. We agree. We need to help people in order to get the proper answer.

The other thing I would like to point out about this question is that even if we use the write-in question, there is no loss in data available in the census tabulations. In fact, there is a gain in data. The way we are going to go about coding the write-in answers allows us to produce counts by each of the Asian and Pacific subgroups written in. We will do that. We will do the kind of tabulations people were anticipating. That is, there will be data for a specific subgroup cross classified by the other items on the census questionnaire. If you want to know about the educational status of Samoans compared to the educational status of Hawaiians, that is something that can be done using the write-in question. Certainly we will provide that kind of information.

The last thing I would like to mention is there is no right answer to what is your race. We are not anthropologists. No one is looking for blood lines or anything like that. It is a social concept. It changes over time. I fully recognize some people are not able to answer the race question precisely. You may be of mixed race, not know which one to list first, and so on.

We don't have a perfect answer for that. However, I do think the write-in gives people the most opportunity and flexibility for the future. Someone asked earlier today, Can you do follow-on surveys of a specific group? The answer is you can, if funded, of course. But the write-in question would allow the biggest opportunity to identify an appropriate subgroup and to go out and do further study of them. I don't want to get too argumentative about this, but if we have to list the question as it was in 1980, that may not be the best eight groups. I know the law as written allows for a different listing of groups. Even so, you still have to make some choices and leave some groups out and ask people to write them in.

That situation led to some confusion in 1980. It also led to some confusion with some non-Asian groups. When they saw ethnicity listed in the race question, they felt like they should be answering their ethnicity in the race question. Quite a few people when they saw Chinese, Japanese, etc. listed, said where do I put myself down as French? We have to face that issue as well. In summary, what I think I am trying to say to you is we are committed to having a good count. We think the write-in question was going to do that. But, we want to do what is necessary to make the census successful. Regardless of whether we use the listing version or the write-in version, I hope people will understand and work with us to obtain a good census.

Congressman Dymally, I have comments on some of the other things raised earlier this morning. Perhaps you would like me to stop here for questions about the format of the race question.

Mr. DYMALLY. No. Please proceed.

Mr. BOUNPANE. A few words about some of the concerns raised by the representatives from the Pacific Islands. I am very happy that we have had the opportunity to visit the Pacific territories. I was fortunate enough to be on one of those trips. I do agree we have done better than we did in 1980. However, I hear very clearly there are still communications problems. I want you to understand I heard that. I am going to take that issue back to headquarters. We will find a way to communicate even better with the Pacific territories in the future.

Someone asked if the staff from the Pacific territories can review local outreach plans? The answer is absolutely yes. That is our intention. We will write this plan; then bring it to the Pacific territories, have them look at it and comment on it, and then include their comments as appropriate.

Someone asked if the Pacific territories could review the questionnaire before it goes to print? Absolutely. We are going to send the questionnaire to them very soon. Staff from the Pacific territories will get to see the questionnaire before we go to the printer. It won't satisfy all of your needs unfortunately. I know the people in Guam would like some questions added to the questionnaire. We did not add them. I am sorry. We looked at all of your suggested questions and tried to add as many as possible. We did add most of them. Some we are still leaving out. I know it may not make you feel better, but you should understand that stateside we got two and three times as many requests for questions on the questionnaire than we actually were able to include. That was not the case in Guam, where we were able to accommodate all but a few of their requests.

As far as the tabulations go, this is a point where there is some disagreement. There are several steps in the tabulation process. One is coding the questionnaire for handwritten entries. Then, once coded into numeric form, getting the data into the computer, editing it and actually doing the tabulation. The new microcomputer system uses standardized editing software and standardized tabulation software. However, you get to determine the parameters for those edits and for the tabulations. We certainly plan to work with the interagency groups to develop both editing specifications and the tabulation specifications. Once that is done, the physical location of where the computer tabulation actually occurs, should not be too much of an issue. The one thing that might be an issue is what to do with coding the questionnaire—that is, locally as opposed to coding the questionnaire stateside. For example, you ask someone where do you work and they give an answer. Next, a clerk in Jeffersonville, Indiana has to find that answer in a look-up table and convert it into a numeric code. That may be a lot harder than if someone on the Island of Guam did the coding because that person knows precisely where that person is working. This is an issue we face stateside as well where we also do centralized coding. There are many people who feel that the place-of-work question should be coded locally in all of our 450 district offices around the country. While we don't have any major disagreement with that philosophy, we do have some control problems. I think the way around this problem may be to have staff from the Pacific territories work with us on the development of those coding specifica-

tions. We certainly hope some of these IPA's we have been talking about will come through.

You mentioned, Mr. Chairman, we did do an IPA in the Virgin Islands. That was very successful. I am hopeful we can work out a few IPA's for the Pacific Islands as well.

Now, let me turn to a few things. Will we need bilingual interviewers, do we want to use them? Yes. Just as stateside, our goal is to use indigenous enumerators. That is people from the area to work in the area where they live. If it is an area where languages other than English are commonly spoken, by all means, we need to have a person there who is capable of speaking the language of the people.

On the issue someone raised of including native Hawaiians with native Americans, I am afraid I cannot comment too much on that. I will go back and look at OMB policy number 15. I think you yourself, Congressman Dymally, began to ask some of the questions I want to ask. That is precisely how would the question be worded and what would the impact be on the quality of the answers. We do, however, publish information on multiple ancestry. I wanted to be sure people understood that. The race question is one question. The ancestry question is a different one. Ancestry is what country or background are you from. People tend to answer that question with multiple answers. Quite often the mother is from one country and the father from another. We do show tabulations of multiple ancestry already and plan to do more of that in 1990 than in 1980. I don't know about multiple race which is what I think someone asked as opposed to multiple ethnicity. Perhaps that is something we need to look at. We understand the difficulty of making a person choose one race category. I hope the solution is in our instructional materials. We can make the proper way to answer as clear as possible. I don't think we are ever going to be in the position of showing multiple race in the tables. As you can imagine, if someone responds part black and part Hawaiian, then how should we choose to tabulate them? Should we tabulate a half-person with this group, the other half with the other group? We are putting the burden on the respondent, saying please pick the one that is most prominent to you.

Finally, let me comment about something Pat Luce brought up; that is, don't concentrate too much on the national media. I think that is an excellent point. We don't plan to. In fact, since we are a pro bono customer begging for space on the airwaves, we are not likely to get a lot of time on the national media. We do better with local affiliates, with local newspapers, small little stations, etc. If those are more appropriate to the communities we are talking about, and it seems they are, that's all to the better. That's what we do plan to do.

I picked out what I thought were some of the key things that people mentioned here today. Now I would be glad to answer any questions about those or other topics.

Mr. DYMALLY. I have one. What about the delivery? Guam received their delivery late in 1970 and 1980. What are you doing to correct that?

Mr. BOUNPANE. I think that problem was not so much one of mail systems. The mail system has obviously improved and the

number of flights have increased. The problem was our planning. We produced the products late. We must get materials, manuals, pencils, etc., ready on time and get them to the islands on time.

Mr. DYMALLY. Congressman?

Mr. AKAKA. I was interested in your multiethnic racial question and my question to you is on the write-ins, you answered it partly by saying they will have to—the respondent must make a choice. Would you then take only one, for instance, the person writing in Hawaiian and Irish or something like that, is that acceptable? Must he choose only Hawaiian or Irish?

Mr. BOUNPANE. We ask them to choose, but some people obviously do what you said. They write down more than one because they have no way of choosing. Then there are a set of rules for determining which category we include them in. It depends upon the responses of other people in the same household, etc. As we go through these rules, there is a point when we tabulate by the first one listed. I think some people were very concerned about that rule because the natural tendency for some of the part Hawaiians was to list the Hawaiians second. Perhaps we need to work on that problem in terms of our coding rules and instructional materials.

Mr. DYMALLY. Does the director want to make any observations?

Mr. SCHILLING. I don't think so. Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Bounpane, thank you very much. Mr. Akaka.

Mr. AKAKA. One more question. Knowing that in the Pacific and in your jurisdiction now in the Pacific, I am sure it is your intention to try to get to every individual. Now what happens about those outlying islands with small populations? Will you also reach those?

Mr. BOUNPANE. I am sorry, Congressman. I am not sure I understand the question.

Mr. DYMALLY. The Mariana Islands?

Mr. AKAKA. Yes.

Mr. BOUNPANE. We certainly plan to do the census there as well on each of the islands that are part of the Northern Marianas.

Mr. AKAKA. Thank you.

Mr. DYMALLY. Thank you very much.

Let me thank you. Since we have heard all our witnesses, I would like to thank all those who have traveled so far and all the witnesses for coming and making what I thought was a very successful hearing. Thank you very much. The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, the hearing was adjourned at 11:45 a.m.]

[The prepared statement submitted by Mr. Bounpane follows:]

MR. PETER A. ROUNPANE
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, DECENNIAL CENSUS
BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today to discuss plans for conducting the 1990 census in Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Census Day--April 1, 1990--is fast approaching. It's just a little over a year away--459 days to be exact. As we reported to you on September 27, major census preparatory activities are well underway. These include address list compilation and the acquisition of space for our temporary regional, district, and processing offices. We plan to begin awarding contracts for printing of the stateside questionnaires next month.

The 1990 census will be the 21st in an unbroken chain since 1790, and, thus, will mark the Bicentennial of census-taking in the United States. Hawaii, which was annexed by the United States in 1898, has been included in each census beginning in 1900. The 1990 census will be the tenth U.S. census in Hawaii, and the fourth since statehood. After the acquisition of Guam and American Samoa in 1899 and 1900, respectively, censuses were taken at various times under the direction of the governors. Beginning in 1920, Guam and American Samoa have been included in each U.S. decennial census. The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands has been included in each decennial census beginning with 1970.

Today, I will discuss the census procedures, promotion efforts--including outreach to community organizations, and the role of the State and local

governments in Hawaii. Then I will discuss the planning process, census procedures and questionnaire processing, outreach, and government activities in Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands.

HAWAII

Census Procedures

First, census procedures in Hawaii.

Overall management and geographic, outreach, and administrative support for the census of Hawaii will be provided by our Regional Census Center in Seattle, Washington. Mr. Leo Schilling, our Regional Director there, is here with me today.

We plan to establish temporary district offices in Honolulu and Waipahu to conduct the 1990 census in Hawaii. The managers and all other personnel for these offices will be hired locally. The district offices will be responsible for seeing that a completed census questionnaire is obtained from every housing unit and doing the initial processing of the questionnaires. Once the questionnaires are complete, they will be shipped for further processing to our processing center in San Diego, California.

We will conduct the census here in Hawaii much as we do elsewhere in the country. For about 92 percent of the housing units, we will use mail-out/mail-back census procedures. We are currently compiling an address list and will mail a questionnaire to each housing unit on the list. We will ask that the householder fill it out and return it to the local census office. We will send enumerators to those housing units for which questionnaires

are not returned. We have just completed our prelist operation in the State. Prelist is an address-listing operation for areas where we do not purchase lists from commercial vendors because we cannot assign the addresses to the correct geographic locations using our computers or where lists are not available at all. Earlier this year we purchased addresses for the Honolulu area and the U.S. Postal Service just recently completed an updating and correction of this list.

For the 8 percent of the State's housing units in areas where mail-census procedures probably would not produce good coverage, we will use a list/enumerate procedure. Mail carriers will deliver unaddressed short-form questionnaires to each housing unit on their routes with instructions to the householders to complete them and hold them until an enumerator visits to pick them up. Enumerators will visit every housing unit, list the address in an address book, and collect a completed short-form questionnaire or conduct an interview if a questionnaire has not been completed. For a sample of these housing units, the enumerators will ask the additional questions that are only on the long-form questionnaire. We will enumerate group quarters by personal visit or through special arrangements with administrators. Group quarters include military barracks, college dormitories, nursing homes, and so on.

To conduct the enumeration, we will need to hire, train, and retain a large, high-quality workforce--about 490,000 persons Nationwide over the course of the 1990 census. In all, we will require about 2,000 persons to fill census jobs in Hawaii, with about 900 working at the peak of operations in April/May 1990. It will be a challenge to recruit sufficient numbers of employees, particularly in areas with low unemployment and

high wages. To give us a better chance to do so, we are exploring new means to recruit workers, including contacts with national and local organizations. We also are strengthening enumerator training, pay, and management to help us reduce the high turnover experienced in previous censuses and to improve the quality of the enumerators' work. We have made enumerator training more interesting and relevant to the job. We plan to give supplemental pay to enumerators in mail-census areas who are productive, do good work, and complete their assignments on schedule. We plan to tighten supervision of enumerators by requiring that the crew leaders review the enumerators' work daily.

Promotion Efforts and Outreach to Community Organizations

Second, promotion efforts and outreach to community organizations in Hawaii.

Public cooperation is the cornerstone of a successful census. Without public cooperation, no matter how good our procedures and methodology are, we could not have a complete count and be able to produce accurate data in a timely manner.

A creative and ambitious promotion campaign is essential if we are to maintain or increase public cooperation. One of the important goals of our promotion campaign will be to achieve a high mail-return rate. Taking the census for most of the Nation's (including Hawaii's) population by mail will allow us to keep costly personal visits to a minimum and to concentrate our efforts and resources on the remaining households and persons. The other important goal is to encourage everyone to include himself or

herself in the census so that it will be as accurate as possible. Our promotion campaign emphasizes the importance of being counted in the census and is designed to ease concerns about census confidentiality.

For the 1990 census, we plan an extensive, multifaceted promotion campaign. For the first time, we asked the Advertising Council to arrange for the services of minority advertising agencies to supplement the general advertising campaign and to appeal more directly to minority audiences. The Ad Council just recently selected Muse Cordero Chen, Inc., to design a TV, radio, and newspaper campaign for Asian audiences. In addition to the general-audience and Asian campaigns, there will be ad campaigns targeted to Blacks and Hispanics.

Another important part of our outreach activities is the census education project, which is aimed at promoting awareness and knowledge of the decennial census among school children who, in turn, will pass that awareness and knowledge on to their parents. In some cases, particularly in families where not all members speak English, older children may help fill out the questionnaires. The Census Bureau has prepared a package of reproducible lessons and activities that teachers can use in their classrooms; one package will be sent to each school in Hawaii and the rest of the country. These teaching materials will provide an invaluable teaching resource that will improve students' knowledge about the census and their skills in citizenship, math, and other subjects. The census education project materials will be sent to the schools in March 1989, 10 months earlier than for the 1980 census. This will give educators time to build the materials into their curricula and to customize the lesson activities as necessary.

We also have a religious organizations project aimed at getting the help of religious organizations in encouraging their members to participate in the 1990 census. This project will involve getting census messages into newsletters, bulletins, and services, as well as efforts to provide assistance in filling the questionnaires.

Working through national organizations (including minority organizations) is another key part of our promotion campaign. By encouraging their members to answer the census, placing census stories in their publications, and putting us on their conference agenda, they can play a very important role in promoting the census. We staff exhibit booths at meetings, conduct workshops, and make presentations. New for 1990 is an effort to formalize the active participation of national organizations in the 1990 census. We are asking the governing body of each organization to hold a "decisionmaker" meeting to pass an official endorsement of cooperation with the 1990 census. Eighteen Asian and Pacific Islander national organizations have already issued formal endorsements of the 1990 census effort.

We also are seeking to motivate local community action groups and service providers to support the census by encouraging their members and clients to be included. We do this through one-on-one contacts between our community awareness specialists and the leaders and membership of the community groups. Part of this effort will include specialists who work with minority media. We have one community awareness specialist working full time in Hawaii now and plan to have an additional person working here by early next year.

State and Local Government

Third, joint participation between the Census Bureau and State and local governments.

An important part of our outreach effort is our commitment to cooperate closely with State and local officials to make the census a success in their areas. We have instituted a number of new programs and improved some 1980 census programs to increase joint cooperation between the Census Bureau and State and local governments. We are asking State and local officials to help us make the census better in their area by aiding the census effort in six key ways: (1) Promote the census and build public cooperation, (2) identify good candidates for temporary census jobs, (3) find free space for local census operations, (4) review preliminary census totals, (5) assist in special situations, such as identifying shelters and street locations where we will enumerate the homeless, and (6) answer our Boundary and Annexation Survey, which will inform us of the official 1990 census boundaries of the governmental units as of January 1, 1990. For the latter, in Hawaii, we will check with the State to be sure our files show the current county boundaries.

Mr. Schilling has met with representatives of the Governor's office, State agencies, and the State's congressional offices. We have ongoing contact with the State Data Center in Hawaii; the lead agency here is the State Department of Business and Economic Development. The State Data Center Program, initiated in the late 1970s, is aimed at sharing and disseminating census data products throughout each State. We are working closely with the State Data Centers to increase their role in the 1990 census. In most States, the State Data Centers participated or will participate as

liaisons in geographic areas delineation programs. We are producing a 1990 census handbook that suggests activities that the State Data Centers can undertake to promote the census within their organizations, affiliated agencies, local communities, and States. We also are working with the State government here to provide useful data that can be used in redrawing legislative district boundaries after the 1990 census.

As part of our commitment to work closely with local officials in planning and implementing the 1990 census, we have initiated a new series of one-on-one meetings with the mayors or chief elected officials of about 350 large cities and other appropriate governmental units. In the case of Hawaii, this includes the four counties of Honolulu, Hawaii, Maui, and Kauai, all of which Mr. Schilling has visited this year. These meetings are held to discuss mutual concerns about the 1990 census and possible joint efforts for encouraging the populations of the government to be counted in 1990. To assure ongoing contact between the local governments and the Census Bureau staff, we are asking the highest elected officials to appoint high-level liaisons to represent their communities in these discussions.

The local review program gives local officials in approximately 39,000 governmental jurisdictions--including the four counties here in Hawaii--an opportunity to review preliminary 1990 census counts and work with the Census Bureau to improve the census counts. We began our contacts with local officials earlier this time than for the 1980 census so they will have more time to prepare. Our Regional Census Center staff conducted training here on the local review program earlier this year; a second workshop is planned for next year. New for 1990, we plan to give jurisdictions in mail-census areas two opportunities to review the counts; other jurisdictions will have one opportunity.

We plan to provide the counts in all areas at the lowest level for which we present data--the census block. In fact, new for 1990, block data will be available for the entire State, including military installations.

As we did in the 1980 census, we are suggesting that each governmental jurisdiction establish a complete count committee or use existing mechanisms to generate local promotional activities that will build support for the census. Locally generated promotion activities are an essential complement to the national and regional promotion activities and messages the Census Bureau will generate. Here in Hawaii, complete count committee activities could involve organizing a parade in conjunction with Aloha Day; sponsoring an event at the Waikiki Shell; taping public service announcements featuring the Governor, U.S. Senators, Congressmen, or mayors; or distributing flyers at the State fair.

GUAM, AMERICAN SAMOA, AND THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS

Planning

Now, I will discuss the 1990 censuses of Guam, American Samoa, and the Northern Mariana Islands. First, the census planning process.

As in past censuses, the governments of the Pacific territories will be responsible for the data collection phase of the census and we will be responsible for the overall planning, data processing, tabulation, and publication phases. We will cover costs for all phases, including data-collection. Next year, we will finalize agreements with each government,

as we have in recent censuses; these agreements will detail the specific responsibilities that they and we will have for conducting the census.

Next fall, we will appoint a census advisor from our headquarters staff to serve in each area. The census advisors' main responsibilities will be to train the local manager and assist in training other local staff; to assist in keeping expenditures within budget and certify payroll claims; provide guidance and technical support; and serve as liaison between the Census Bureau and the local census office. Most other responsibilities related to the data collection will rest with the local governments.

We have been working closely with the governments to plan the censuses in their areas. The questionnaires for the Pacific territories are different from the ones used for the 50 States and the District of Columbia in order to meet the different data needs of those areas. In 1986, we asked each government to appoint a lead agency to organize and chair an interagency working group to make recommendations on the content of the census questionnaires. The Governor of Guam gave this responsibility to the Director of Commerce; the Governor of American Samoa chose the Deputy Director of the Economic Development and Planning Office; and the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands selected the Director of the Department of Commerce and Labor. We are grateful to the interagency working groups and the agency heads that chaired them for their hard work and contributions toward questionnaire development.

In late 1986, the interagency working groups sent us their initial recommendations on questionnaire content. In late January and early February 1987, other Census Bureau employees and I visited the Pacific

territories to discuss questionnaire content, processing, enumeration plans, and other issues, such as outreach. In July 1988, we sent each Governor and each interagency committee a questionnaire proposal that incorporated most of the recommendations we received from the interagency committees on our 1987 trip and in subsequent communications. In August 1988, Census Bureau staff members again visited each interagency working group to conduct further discussions on questionnaire content; during that trip and subsequently we received additional recommendations for the modification or expansion of several questions.

We are reviewing the recommendations brought back by our representatives and making every effort to incorporate the recommendations into a questionnaire that is tailored to meet the specific data needs of each area, while at the same time maintaining some basic consistency to provide comparable data for each area and to facilitate processing. We will transmit shortly the revised version of the questionnaire to each Governor and interagency committee for final review. We plan to send the questionnaires to the Office of Management and Budget for clearance early in 1989.

Census Procedures and Questionnaire Processing

Second, census procedures and questionnaire processing for the three areas.

We will use the list/enumerate procedure for all three areas. As in stateside areas where we use this procedure, the enumerators will visit every housing unit and list the address in an address listing book. They will conduct a personal interview at each household, asking the questions and recording the answers. Unlike in the States (where we will use two versions of the questionnaire--short and long), we will enumerate every person and housing

unit using only the long form. Also, in American Samoa and the Northern Mariana Islands, the enumerators will collect data for the Census of Agriculture at the same time.

We will process questionnaires for the three areas separately from stateside questionnaires using an integrated microcomputer processing system developed by our International Statistical Programs Center (ISPC). The ISPC used the integrated microcomputer processing system to process the 1985 census of Pohnpei, which is part of the Federated States of Micronesia. Once the 1990 enumeration has been completed, the questionnaires will be shipped to our processing center in Jeffersonville, Indiana, where the data will be keyed onto floppy disks. The Jeffersonville processing office will send the data to the ISPC for final editing and tabulating.

This system is an exciting and innovative new approach that provides flexibility to allow for minor variations in content and output and should expedite the release of the 1990 data products for the Pacific territories. In 1980 and previous censuses, questionnaires for these areas were processed using the same system as for the States, and they tended to get pushed back to the end. We believe the use of the microcomputer processing system for 1990 will be a great improvement.

Promotion

Third, the promotion program for Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

As in the states, public cooperation is essential to a good census, and we must have an effective promotion program to achieve a high level of public cooperation. The goal of the program in these areas will be to create an awareness among the residents about the importance of the census and the guarantees of confidentiality for individual census information. The tangible results of such an effort will be an accurate, complete census conducted in the most cost-effective manner possible.

We expect to submit to each area next spring our formal proposal for the promotion program, including both publicity and outreach activities. Today, I will briefly outline our initial plans in four areas--advertising and publicity, the census education project, the religious organizations project, and the complete count committee program.

Advertising and publicity materials will include public service announcements with territorial celebrities and dignitaries; news releases, feature stories, and press kits; and collateral materials such as leaflets, pamphlets, decals, bumper stickers, and posters. We will attempt to provide as many of these materials as possible customized to the local area.

The census education project plan and goals are the same as in the states. We are adapting the materials specifically for use in the Pacific territories. We plan to distribute the materials beginning in the summer of 1989 so they can be built into the school curricula and further adapted as necessary.

The religious organizations project will be an important avenue for urging public cooperation with the 1990 census. We plan to provide census messages that can be used in the church newsletters and bulletins as well as read to the congregations by the church officials at their services.

We also will encourage government officials to establish complete count committees, which can undertake locally initiated and designed promotion activities to augment the overall promotion effort. For example, the complete count committees can organize brochure distributions, see that posters get placed in public places, and arrange for local celebrities to film public service announcements.

Government Activities

Fourth, I will discuss joint efforts with the governments of the Pacific territories to make the census geographic area delineation and postcensus review of counts better.

The governments of the Pacific territories have been involved in programs to help us delineate certain census geographic areas. For the 1990 decennial census, data will be presented by census blocks for each of these areas for the first time. Census blocks are the smallest areas for which we tabulate census data. They can be blocks in developed areas bounded by streets on four sides or other parcels of land bounded by visible features such as a stream, road, power line, and so on. Each territory has participated in a Census Bureau program to delineate groups of blocks that are used as tabulation areas. Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands also are participating in a program to delineate census designated places, which are closely settled population centers without official corporate limits.

Finally, we plan to provide the governments of the Pacific territories with the guidelines to conduct a postcensus review of census counts. The Governors may designate a staff member or a high-level official to act as the liaison for local review of the counts. However, to provide

an independent check of the data, the person or persons reviewing the data should not be connected with the data collection activities during the 1990 census.

CLOSING

In closing, I will mention that this last summer, the monograph on the 1980 census of Guam, entitled "Guam's People: A Continuing Heritage" was published. This impressive volume was prepared by the Guam Interagency Committee on Population (the interagency working group that developed the questionnaire for Guam), with contributions by nine of its members. The monograph was designed to help local planners prepare for the 1990 census. The monographs for American Samoa and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands will be published early next year. Michael Levin of the Census Bureau's Population Division contributed to all three volumes.

I also am pleased to report that Guam has joined the State Data Center network along with all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Governor Joseph Ada and Mr. Peter Barcinas, Acting Director of the Department of Commerce, signed a memorandum of understanding creating the Territorial Data Center in May 1988. The Department of Commerce and the University of Guam have key responsibilities under the agreement. They will work with affiliated agencies to provide training and technical assistance in accessing and using data for research, administration, planning, and decision-making by the government, the business community, university researchers, and other interested data for Guam. They also will improve access to and extend the use of Census Bureau statistical resources and related products including computerized data. We look forward to working with them.

Also, I will add a few words about Palau. We enumerated Palau as part of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands in 1980. Since the government of Palau currently is negotiating its future political status with the U.S. Government, we have requested the advice of the State Departments' Office of Freely Associated States regarding the inclusion of Palau in the 1990 census. As soon as we clarify our position with the State Department, we will notify the government of Palau about how we will proceed regarding its participation in the 1990 census.

We believe we will have successful censuses in Hawaii and in the Pacific territories in 1990. We have worked closely and will continue to work closely with officials in all areas to devise plans for taking the best census possible. Although we have completed much already, our work is not done. As we approach April 1, 1990, we must all pull together to encourage a high level of public support and cooperation. Working together, we can reach our mutual goal of an accurate, complete, and timely census for Hawaii, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

○